PRÆCURSOR:

OR A

FORERUNNER

To a large Review of the Dispute concerning

INFANT-BAPTISM;

Wherein many things both Doctrinall and personal are cleared: about which Mr.

RICHARD BAXTER

In a Book MOCK-TITLED

[*PLAIN SCRIPTURE-PROOF OF INFANTS CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP AND BAPTISM*] hath darkned the Truth.

By JOHN TOMES B. D.

LONDON,

Printed by *H. Hils*, and are to be sold by *H. Crips* and *Lod. Lloyd* in Popes-head Ally, *T. Brewster* and *G. Moule* at the three Bibles at the West end of *Pauls*, 1652.

Tho: Barnard hooke

PRECURSOR:

OR A

FORERUNNER

To a large Review of the Dispute concerning

INFANT-BAPTISM;

Wherein many things both Doctri-
nall and personal are cleared: about which Mr.

RICHARD BAXTER

In a Book Mock-titled

PLAIN SCRIPTURE-PROOF OF INFANTS CHURCH-MEMBERSHIP AND BAPTISM, hath darkned the Truth.

BY JOHN TOMBS D.D.

LONDON,
Printed by H. Hills, and are to be sold by H. Crept and Lod. Lloyd in Popes-head Ally, T. Brewster and G. Wood at the three Bibles at the Westend of Paul's, 1652.

To the right Honourable Bulstrode Whitlock, Richard Keble, *Serjeants at Law*, John Lisle *Esq*; *Lords Commissioners for the Great Seal of* England, *Major General* Thomas Harrison, Edmund Prideaux *Esquire*, *Attorney General for the State of* England, Denis Bond *Esquire*.

THrough the influence of the favour of many of you as instruments of the Lord for my liberty to preach the Gospel and peace at the Temple in *London*, I enjoyed sundry years in the late tempestuous times an unexpected calm, until a new storm arising by reason of the violence of men bent to bear down dissenters from the determinations of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, by reason of the publishing my *Examen* of Mr. *Marshals* Sermon for Infant-baptism, I was necessitated to leave the harbour I had at the Temple, and to remove a great distance from *London*, to the place of my nativity, in which I hoped for a setlement, which I found not. For partly by the States selling my lands out of which my maintenance there arose, and partly by reason of the alienating of mens spirits from me through the distance between me and the Antagonist I here answer, I was in a great measure frustrated of my hopes. But it pleased

pleased the *Lord* nevertheless to order things so, that by the means of some of you as Patrons, and others as helpers, I enjoy a comfortable supply for my maintenance, together with that which is dearer to me, the liberty of holding forth the truth of the Gospel, where I laboured many years heretofore. In testimony of my thankful acknowledgement of that ample favour which it pleased some of you to vouchsafe me by your appearing for me, and bounty to me at the Temple, and testimonial of me at my departure thence, the readiness of you all either to invest, or to settle me in the maintenance I now enjoy, & that there may be something in your hands to vindicate me from injurious aspersions, under which my self with the truth I avouch do suffer much, I humbly presume to present this writing to your hands, and praying that you may honor God in your places who hath raised you up to do him service, I subscribe my self

Lemster, December 16. 1651.

Your Honours humble
and real servant,

JOHN TOMBES.

To the dearly beloved, my Auditors formerly the Inhabitants of *Bewdly* in *Worcestershire*.

THe fame of the diſpute between *Mr.* Baxter *and my ſelf at your Chappel*, Jan. 1. 1649. *was at firſt ſpread over the land by Mr.* Bs. *abuſive paſſage in his Epiſtle before his book of* The Saints everlaſting reſt: *to which I oppoſed an anſwer in my Farewell-ſpeech to you, and that it might be communicated to the Nation printed it with ſome additions in my Antidote, which I intended in the firſt place for your uſe. After this Mr.* B. *printed a large book for Infants-baptiſm, framed in manner of a Sermon as intended, and accordingly tendred in an Epiſtle to you. In which how injuriouſly he hath dealt with me, and how weakly he hath oppoſed the truth I taught you, will appear in part by reading this Forerunner to the reſt of the anſwer that is to come after. I did preſently upon my firſt reading of Mr.* Bs. *book in a ſet ſpeech briefly ſhew you Mr.* Bs. *grounds, and the reaſon why they were unſatisfying. Yet neither my Antidote nor that ſpeech do I find much regarded by many of you: nor perhaps will this writing take much with you. However I have conceived it neceſſary to tender this writing to you, that it might thereby appear, how vain the exceſſive boaſtings of Mr.* Bs *book have been; how juſtifiable their receiving the truth, who have yielded to it is; and how inexcuſable they are that perſiſt in Mr.* Bs. *way. What ever you think or ſpeak of me, yet I do, and ſhall ſtudy your good, and committing my labours for you and among you, to the bleſſing of the Lord, I reſt,*

Lemſter Oct. 1. 1651.

Your loving Countrey-
man and ſervant in Chriſt,

JOHN TOMBES.

The Contents.

Sect. I. *Of the necessity and occasion of this present writing.*

Sect. II. *That the Title of Mr.* Baxters *book, is a mock-title.*

Sect. III. *Mr.* Baxters *citations from Fathers, advantage him not.*

Sect. IV. *Mr.* Baxters *citations from my writings, advantage him not.*

Sect. V. *Mr.* Baxter *unduly suggests many things in his Epistles.*

Sect. VI. *The chief points of Mr.* Baxters *book are very briefly touched.*

Sect. VII. *Many personal occurrences are cleered: by relating of which Mr.* Baxter *hath (in his History) sought to create prejudice against me.*

Sect. VIII. *More personal matters, which the History of Mr.* Baxter *hath made crooked, are set straight.*

Sect. IX. *In my alleging* Peter de Bruis *and others as Antipedobaptists 500. years ago, is no untruth.*

Sect. X. *That Mr.* Baxters *charge of accusing and of disputing my children out of the Church and Covenant of Christ, is vain: and some inquiry is made, how they are in Covenant.*

Sect. XI. *About Mr.* Baxters *4. Texts, urged impertinently to prove Infants visible Church-membership.*

Sect. XII. *That Mr.* Baxter *unjustly chargeth me to be a Sect-Master.*

Sect. XIII. *That it is not a right way to judge of the truth of doctrine, by strange accidents, though wonderful.*

Sect. XIV. *That Mr.* Baxter *doth not rightly expound Christs rule,* Mat. 7. 15, 16. *nor is unholiness of men a note to know false doctrine by.*

Sect. XV. *Mr.* Baxters *insinuations of the wickedness of Anabaptists, is Calumniatory, and vainly alleged to condemne their doctrine of Antipedobaptism: Anabaptists, and with them my self, are vindicated from charges of Schism, neglect of the Lords day, &c.*

Sect. XVI. *The ground of my opposing Infant-baptism, is confirmed by Mr.* Baxter *himself.*

Sect.

The Contents.

Sect. XVII. *The gross absurdities, to which Mr. Baxter wanted I was driven in the dispute.*

Sect. XVIII. *The gross untruths Mr. Baxter chargeth me with, are not such.*

Sect. XIX. *The 6. imagined errors charged on me by Mr. Baxter are cleered from his censure.*

Sect. XX. *Many learned men (with the Oxford Convocation) of former & later times, take Infant-baptism only for an unwritten Tradition.*

Sect. XXI. *Many things are cleared about my Conformity, Anabaptists necessity to be baptized, the manner of dipping used by them; their standing to their confession of faith, &c.*

Sect. XXII. *The speech [that no one Country is gathered into Christs visible Church] containes no malignancy to Christ, but is a manifest truth.*

ERRATA.

PAge 2. l. 13. debare reade debate, p. 4. l. 14. specially r. speciously, p. 5. l. 3. after r. afore, p. 7. l. 7. contrary r. century, p. 13. l. 9. way r. man, p. 14. l. 18. conceive r. convince, p. 15. l. 15. wickedness r. weakness, p. 16. l. 15. weari r. wani. p. 19. l. 27. 1649. r. 1646. p. 20. l. 30. alteration r. altercation, p. 21. l. 18. r. is con- p. 22. l. 29. and r. I, p. 26. l. 23. r. I been. l. 35. d. likely is, p. 30. l. 9. 3. 4. r. 314. p. 31. l. 24. singularly r. singularity, p. 32. l. 11. hot r. not, p. 33. l. 18. overlasting r. overlashing, p. 37. l. 37. mysteriis r. mysticis, p. 38. l. 25. l. is, is as, l. 28. scoffically r. scoptically, p. 42. l. 19. r. r. 10. p. 44. l. 2. eternally r. eventually, l. 20. r. 28. Act. p. 45. l. 2. r. this is, p. 49. l. 3. r. 405. l. 4. d. l. 28. absolutely r. resolutely, p. 51. l. 33. they r. them, l. 35. accident r. antecedent, p. 53. l. 1. r. 9. r. 8. p. 57. l. 15. r. knew them, p. 58. l. 18. me the d me. But what r. that, p. 60. l. 38. notions r. motions, p. 62. l. 35. r. Amplius, p. 63. l. 17. alteration r. altercation, p. 65. l. 1. in r. I, p. 72. l. 7. r. come to me, p. 73. l. 14. r. if he, l. 14. el r. al, l. 25. r. I s. r. ran (i. e. any r. my.

Mr. Richard BAXTER *in the 2. Edition of* THE SAINTS EVERLASTING REST, *part. 1. chap. 8. sect. 5. pag. 1795. in the margin, hath these words.*

AND in the primitive times none were baptized without an expresse Covenanting, wherein they renounced the World, Flesh and Devil; and engaged themselves to Christ, and promised to obey him; as you may see in *Tertul. Origen, Cyprian*, and others at large. I will cite but one for all, who was before the rest, and that is *Justin Martyr*; speaking of the way of baptizing the aged, saith, *How we are dedicated to God, we will now open to you. As many as being perswaded do believe these things to be true which we teach, and do promise to live according to them, they first learn by prayer and fasting to beg pardon of God for their former sins; our selves joining also our prayer and fasting. Then they are brought to the water, and are born again* (or baptized) *in the same way as we our selves were born again. For they are washed with water in the name of the Father, the Lord and God of all; and of our Saviour Jesus Christ; and of the Holy Ghost*——*Then we bring the person thus washed and instructed, to the Brethren, as they are called, where the Assemblies are; that we may pray both for our selves and the new illuminated person, that we may be found by true doctrine and by good works, worthy observers and keepers of the Commandments, and that we may attain eternal salvation. Then there is brought to the chief Brother,* (so they called the chief Minister) *Bread, and a Cup of Wine* (washed;) *which taking, he offereth praise and thanksgiving to the Father by the name of the Son and Holy Ghost. And for a while he celebrateth thanksgiving. After prayers and thanksgiving, the whole Assembly saith* Amen. *Thanksgiving being ended by the President* (or chief guide) *& the consent of the whole people, the Deacons as we call them, do give to every one present, part of the Bread and Wine, over which thanks was given; and they also suffer them to bring it to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist, to which no man is to be admitted but onely he that believeth the truth of our doctrine, being washed in the Laver of Regeneration for Remission of sin; and so liveth as Christ hath taught:* Apol. 2. This then is no new overstrict way you see.

PRÆCURSOR, OR A FORERUNNER

to a large Review of the dispute concerning

INFANT-BAPTISME

heretofore mannaged by the Author.

Sect. I.

Of the necessity and occasion of this writing.

IT is the observation of *Solomon Prov.*18.19. (as we now reade it) that *a brother offended is harder to be won then a strong city, and their contentions like the bars of a castle, which being strong will neither bow, nor yield,* say our late *Annotations* on the Place. Which thing as it is true of natural brethren, when they contend about civil affaires, so it is too often found true among Christian brethren, yea even in the ministery of the Gospel, when they contend about the things of Christ whether out of faction, or conscience. We need not go far for instances to prove it: this last age hath verified it too plainly in the contentions between the *Lutherans* & *Calvinists* in *Germany*, *Remonstrants* & *Contraremonstrants* in *Belgia*, *Prelatists* & *non-Conformists*, *Independents* and *Presbyterians* in *England*. Among others the providence of the Lord hath made me *a man of contention*, as the prophet complaines of himself, *Jerem.*15.10, and that which is most

grievous to me with my brethren in the ministery and faith of Christ, with whom I hoped for a brotherly conjunction in the work of Christ, the yoke of *Prelates* being removed, and about that ordinance of baptisme, which should be a bond of union between us, *Ephes.* 4. 5. I with others asserting *infant-baptisme to be a corruption of the ordinance of baptisme*, others avouching it *an of God*, and the contrary *a pernitious error*. The season in which I appeared in this matter, the spirits of men in *Old* and *New England* being very thirsty after reformation in worship according to the word, humane inventions every where cried down, this being taken for a maxime against Papists, and Prelates, *that in Gods worship we must keep close to the institution*, and an Assembly called to that end, and the Parliament with them engaged in solemne Covenant, I taking the way approved by Protestant writers afore I vented any thing in publique to debate the matter with learned Ministers, and after to present my exceptions against *Pedobaptisme* to a Committee of the *Assembly*, gave me hopes of a facile and speedy way for clearing the point. But whether it were that mens resolutions were pitched on the patterns of other Churches, or swayed with prejudice, or fear or something else, I quickly found my hopes deceived, my very dissenting from them though in this candid manner begetting enmity towards me, and notwithstanding my reasons presented to them, Pædobaptisme established in the *Directory*, and the not practising of it, and gainsaying of it made *penal*; which things necessitated me to print my *two Treatises*, and this drew down on me a storme of writers, by whom mens spirits were exasperated against me, whereby I was enforced to print my *Apology*, afore I could review the dispute as I intended. But my *Apology* not preventing my removal from that place where I had better opportunity to write, and print then hithence, yet as soone as I could settle my self and family in any sort I applied my self to review the dispute according to the order of the *Examen* of Mr. *Marshal*: sermon, which I had gone through unto the third conclusion, and had some purpose of printing a part of it by it self, because of the difficulty in printing and sale of large things: Yet afore I did it by reason of the neighbour-hood of Mr. *B.* I imparted some sheetes about 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. to him, out of which he took notes as he pleased, and quickly returned them to me without animadversions on them, which I hoped he would have done of his own accord, as the manner of Schollers of acquaintance is in such cases. After some of my Auditors beginning to enquire after the duty of being baptized, it was propounded by one to have recourse to Mr. *B.* and by me, if they

did

did so, to get his arguments in writing for infant-baptism: but our endeavours not succeeding, I yielded to a dispute though much against my mind, presaging from the knowledge I had of Mr. *Baxters* quickness and my own slowness in answering an argument not under my eye, the favour of the most to Mr. *Bs.* tenet, and averseness from mine, and other accidents; Mr. *B.* likely to gain the fame of a victory, and to put back the work of reformation of that corruption, yet hoping Mr. *B.* would after have imparted to me his arguments in writing, that I might as Dr. *Reynolds* permitted *Hart*, mend my answers afore printing. But Mr. *B.* denying it, and venting the passage in his *Saints everlasting rest*, wherein he speaks of *grosse absurdities I was driven to*, I was forced to print my *Antidote*, since which he hath printed a large book in which he hath raised much dust to darken the truth, and to asperse my person: which I am necessitated to answer, and to stay or order the review of the dispute between my self, Mr. *M.* and others as there shall be cause.

SECT. II.

That the title of Mr. Baxters *book is a mock-title.*

MR. *Bs.* Book is intituled *Plain Scripture-proof of Infants church-membership and baptism*: which is true only *vel* ἀντιφρασει: to the contrary, and might have been more truly intituled, no plain Scripture-proof for infants baptism. Let any man but view his texts which are these: *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 15. 10. *Levit.* 25. 41, 42. *Luke* 9. 47, 48. *with Mat.* 18. 5. *Mark.* 9. 41. *Rom.* 11. 17, 19, 20, 24, 25, 26. *Mat.* 23. 37, 38, 39. *Revel.* 11. 15. *Heb.* 8. 6. & 7. 22. *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. *Rom.* 4. 11. *Exod.* 20. 6. *Josh.* 7. 25, 26. *Deut.* 13. 12, 13, 14. *Exod.* 20. 5. *Num.* 31. 17. *Dan.* 6. 24. *Deut.* 20. 16, 17. *Deut.* 28. 4, 18, 32, 41. *Mal.* 2. 15. 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Mark* 9. 36, 37. & 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. being not prepossessed with his Chymical extractions, but using his own wit or ancient Commentators, yea or modern except about three or four of these texts, and I should as soon expect he should conclude a new world in the moon as Infant-baptisme from them. The very first and only text which speaks a word of baptism is so plain against infant-baptisme, that *Pædobaptists* in their Commentaries and disputes think it enough if they can avoid the force of it against them. Yea is not Mr. Bs. own confession contradictory to the

title of his book? page 3. posit. 1. He tells us *of some things plainly determined in Scripture, others have no such determination.* And saith, *Such is the case of infant-baptisme.* And page 301. *If the very baptisme of infants it self be so darke in the Scripture, that the controversie is thereby become so hard as we finde it, &c.* And if it be *so dark in Scripture, and found so hard by him,* me thinks that he might not be thought to delude people, he should have altered the title, and forborne to talke as he doth in his book of bringing plain Scripture-proof to them that call for them. If I might be allowed to passe my censure on him as he doth on me, I would not stick to say, that laying aside his Rhetorick, his exclamations, interrogations, admirations, expostulations, misapprehensions of my actions and answers, invectives against Anabaptists, and two or three quirkes of wit, there's as little matter to his purpose that hath the likenesse of solidity in his book as I have met within a book so specially set forth, and so much cried up, and that he doth onely *magno conatu nugas agere, endeavour much to trifle much*; and that he had done better with the *Oxford Convocation*, Mr. *Bedford* (as he cites him page 301.) with many others to have rested on tradition unwritten, then to bring such impertinent texts as he hath done for infant-baptisme. But I must remember I am an Antagonist. He saith *he was constrained thereunto unavoidably by my importunity.* Answer, Ti's true I was importunate to have his arguments in writing: but never that he should print them, much lesse print my answers taken onely from my mouth either relying on anothers pen or his own memory. Doctor *Rainolds* dealt not so with *Hart* the Jesuit: nor will I think an ingenuous scholler conceive his dealing candid, who knowes the difference of answering in verbal conference, and writing where the argument is before the respondent. If I were so importunate he might have conceived it was for my satisfaction, which he denies to have been manifested to him page 281. or if it were onely for my neighbours there had been some love in it if we had had them without printing them, specially with such asperity and foule descirptions of me as he makes. But now he hath printed let's look upon them.

SECT. III.

Mr. Baxters *citations from Fathers advantage him not.*

AFter he comes to the arguments which were desired, 20. leaves in *quarto* are spent in sentences, Epistles, and History, and 5. more in a very small letter in 10. positions and 3. propositions to usher in his arguments with state, or rather to prepossesse his Reader. First he sets down 2. texts, which are alleadged in his 26. argument to prove his 2d. main argument, and there I shall meete with them. Then sundry of the Ancients speeches. The first of *Origens* is examined in my *Examen* part. 1. sect 5. and my answer vindicated in my *Apology* sect. 16. page 81. The speech of *August. de bapt. cont. Donat.* l 4. c. 23. (it should be 24.) shewes he found *no Divine authority* for infant-baptisme, but the conceit he had that what the universal Church holdeth came from Apostolical authority, and circumsion of infants. The former is no good rule, as appeares by the tenets of the ancients about Episcopacy, Easter, Millenary opinion, infant-Communion. I will recite some speeches of men very eminent, *Salmas. appar. ad libr. de prim. Papa* page 86. Eutychio *idem usu venit, quod omnibus fermè scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis Græcis, Latinisq, ut dum morem sui temporis spectant à principio sic semper fuisse existimârint:* Molin. *varet lib. 2. c. 13.* page 133. *Dum, inquit, Satan, ampridem orsus primula initia mysterii iniquitatis tam densas tenebras offudit Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ primi seculi sub Apostolis, & post Apostolos superis additos, ut* Baronius *fateatur vix quicquam certi posse statui.* Chamier. *panstr. Cath. tom. 3. lib. 24. c. 16. sect. 50.* (*quasi vero, inquam, non* Cyprianus *quum rebaptizari vellet tinctos apud Hæreticos non plenis buccis occlamaret it à semper observatum fuisse in Ecclesia.* The latter is the common mistake about circumcision, which hath been often answered in my *Exercit. Exam. Apology* page 85. As for the place of *August. tom. 7. de peccat. mer. & remis. l. 3. c. 5. that all Antiquity held, that believers infants do receive remission of original sin by Christian baptisme*, Mr. B. doth not rightly translate the words. For the words are not as Mr. B. translates [*believers little ones, fidelium parvulos;*] but [*fideles parvulos, believing little ones.*] And what he meanes by little ones believing, he shewes *lib. 1. de*

peccat.

peccat.mer.& remiss.cap. 27. *quis autem nesciat credere esse infantibus baptizari, non credere autem non baptizari? who knowes not that to infants to believe is to be baptized, not to believe is not to be baptized?* So that with *Austin* all baptized infants are believers, unbaptized unbelievers: and yet lib. 4. *de bapt.contra Donat.* cap. 23. he saith, that *Certè nondum possunt parvuli infantes corde credere ad justitiam, & ore confiteri ad salutem, Certainly they cannot yet believe with the heart unto righteousnesse, as the pious thief on the crosse, but do withstand by crying their baptism.* But how vain *Austins* judgement was about infant-baptism is shewed in my *Examen part.* 1, Sect. 8. and may be seen by considering how he maintained a like antiquity and necessity of giving infants the Lords Supper both in the passage cited by me in my *Apology* out of the first book *de pecc. meri. & remiss.* cap. 24. pag. 82. and lib. 3. *de pecc. mer. & remiss.* c. 4. next to that which Mr. B. cites which Mr. B. doth not rightly cut off page 162. of his book; whence I gather that Mr. B. is not to be too easily trusted in his citations of Authors. The words he cites out of *Justin Martyr* his Epistle *ad Zenam* prove nothing that is denyed. The testimony of *Cyprian* Epist. 59. is answered in my *Examen* pa. 1. Sc. 7. To Mr. B. his question whether a whole Councel, and all the Church be ignorant whether infants were wont to be baptized 100. years before, when some of themselves or their Fathers were those infants? I answer, they might be ignorant, it being either not at all or very rarely in that time; nor is it known of what age the 66. Bishops of that Councel were when that Epist. was written, nor whose children they were, whether believers or infidels; nor in the whole Epistle is any thing historical set down about the ancient use of infant-baptism: but their determination of the lawfulnesse of it afore the eighth day, which Epistle because *Hierom, Augustin* and others do so much alleadge as their prime testimony for baptizing infants for remission of original sin, and I am taxed for calling it in my *Ex.* p. 1. f. 7. *an absurd Epist.* & Mr. *F. Rous* in his late *Abridgem. of the* 1. *Fathers* hath left out that which was chiefly to have been inserted as the reason of the Councels determination, which *Austin* lib. 3. *de peccat. merit. & remiss.* c. 5. and elsewhere recites; I have therefore translated the whole Epistle into English, and printed it in the end of this writing, not to shew the nakednesse of that Father, as I am accused, but to clear the truth about the antiquity of Infant-baptism. But there is one testimony higher then *Cyprian* which Mr. *B.* urgeth with much earnestnesse, as if he did triumph in it: and it is that of *Pope Hyginus*, who lived about the year 150. or 140. and ordained something about Gossips at infant-baptism, which must needs

shew

shew the Apostles baptized infants. To which I answer, 1. The decree in the Epistle as *Osiander Epit. Hist. Eccl. cent.* 2. lib. 2. c. 5. cites it out of *Gratian* is a word mentions not infant-baptism, though it speak of Gossips which were at other times then infant-baptism. 2. Mr. B. might have taken notice, that *Scultetus med. Patrum part* 1. *lib.* 11. *cap.* 10. saith, *Of all the Epistles of the first Popes, No man that reads them attentively, but acknowledgeth them to be forged.* The *Contrary writers cent.* 2. *c.* 7. judge the same, *Osiander Epitome Eccl. Hist. Cent.* 2. *lib.* 2. *cap.* 5. calls the Author *personatum Hygianum*, and (as I remember) *Rivet*, *Cook*, *James* passe the like censure. *Perkins preparative to the demonstration of the problems.* *These Epistles decretal, which passe under the names of Clemens, Evaristi, Telesphorus, Hyginus, &c. are all forged, and that for sixteen reasons.* yea Doctor *Prideaux* (whom Mr. B. alleadgeth for him) in his *ninth Oration de Pseudoepigraphis Sect.* 3. *censures the decretal epistles of the Ancient Popes as counterfeit.* Lastly, Doctor *Rainolds* in his *Conference with Hart chap.* 8. *divis.* 3. hath so fully proved in a large discourse the bastardise of them, that I could hardly have imagined any learned Protestant would ever have thus alleadged so notoriously forged a writing. So that I need not answer Mr. Bs. allegation of *this testimony by current consent of Historians assuring us*, and his questions thereof, but by telling him he hath reason to be ashamed of abusing men with this forgery after so much he viction of it by learned men, being more like to *a brazen fac'd allegation*, then that he so censures me for without cause: He next addes a speech of *Tertullian de pudic.* cap. 9. and translates it into English. *Transgression in interpretation is not lesse then in conversation*: which I know not why he adds but to shew the evil of my sin in interpretation, as I imagine, of Scripture: which had he demonstrated he had done more then yet hath been done by him, Mr. *M.* or any other. That interpretation I give of 1 *Cor* 7.14. had sundry godly and learned Protestants, *Melanchthor*, *Musculus*, *Camerarius*, *&c.* for it (whose words are printed in my *Exercit.*) before me, nor do Mr. *B.* his arguments or others take me off from it, but are answered in their place. Of my interpretation of *Mat.* 28. 19. Mr. B. pag. 14. saith he will stand to most that I said of it. What I said of *Rom.* 11. 17. *Deut.* 29. 10, 11, 12. I intend to vindicate in its place. My way and course of interpreting Scripture hath been known where I have preached, at *Oxford*, *Worcester*, *Lemster*, *Bristol*, *the Temple in London*, *Bewdley*. If I make conscience of any thing, it is how I interpret Scripture. Mr. B. his interpretations of texts in this book are too grosse, as of *Mat.* 28. 19. *Acts* 15. 10. *Revel.*

11.

11. 15. *Mat.* 23. 37. &c. So farre as I am able to discern by his writings, Sermons and conference, his skill is better in reasoning and amplifying then interpreting Scripture, which I think he had need study better then I can yet perceive he hath done. He takes notice page 191. *of an interpretation (as he is told) of mine of* Mat. 11. 28. which he censures *for a foule interpretation.* He saith, *Sure it is the guilt of sin, and accusation and condemnation of the law with which persons are said to be weary and heavy laden.* But I look for better assurance then Mr. *Bs.* word. I confesse I finde nothing in the text for that sense: but the coherence with ver. 25, 26, 27. shewes ver. 28. to be an invitation to come to Christ as a Teacher, and ver. 29. is an expression of the end of coming to him, to *take his yoke on them*, that is, his doctrine and commands, which is expounded by learning of him: which is confirmed by the motive ver. 30. which is, that his *yoke is easie and burden light*: which can be understood of no other then his doctrine and commands, parallel to 1 *John* 5. 3. as *our translators, Beza, new Annot. Pareus, Piscator, Grotius*, &c. conceive. And he useth sundry arguments to draw them. 1. From the *burdens* on them, which I conceive to be rather meant (the whole context leading thereto) of such Burdens as are mentioned, *Mat.* 23. 3. then of sins which are not named. 2 From his *meeknesse and lowlinesse*, such as should be in a Teacher, 2 *Tim.* 2. 24. opposed to harshnesse, superciliousnesse, disdaine, &c. which is propounded rather as an encouragement to them to learne his doctrine, then (as Mr. *B.* and others) *learn to be meek by my example.* 3. From *the rest they should finde to their soules*, contrary to distraction and disquietnesse by Pharisaical doctrine. 4. From *the ease of his commands*, contrary to the rigorous impositions of those Doctors. And this interpretation seemes to me to be no *foule interpretation*, but so faire as that I can discerne no other in the words.

SECT. IV.

Mr. Bs. citations from my writings advantage him not.

AFter the speech of *Tertullian* he filles a whole page and more with passages out of sundry of my writings, and in the beginning gives this terrible title to them [Mr. *Tombes self condemnation*] and [*ad hominem*]

nem] as if he had an argument from my ſelf againſt me. The firſt paſſage is out of my treatiſe of *ſcandals* pag. 323. where *I reckon Anabaptists among Hereticks and grievous wolves.* To which I anſwer, 1. Mr. B. knowes I deny my ſelf to be an Anabaptiſt, though not my own baptiſme after believing or baptizing of believers, which Chriſt injoyned me, *Mat.*28.19. *Mark* 16.16. with preaching the Goſpel: Nor doth Mr. *B.* or ever will prove that for this I am to be termed an Anabaptiſt, or that the pretended baptiſm of Infants is a diſcharge of that duty Chriſt requires of being baptized into his name common to all Chriſtians, *Epheſ.* 4. 5. 2. Mr. *B.* himſelf pag. 10. yields me an abſolution in theſe words [*on the one ſide ſome think it no leſſe then hereſie to deny infant-baptiſm, and to require rebaptizing; not that the generality of Sober Divines* (among which I hope Mr. *B.* reckons me) *do ſo, but for the reſt of the errors, which almoſt ever do accompany it*] which Mr. *B.* might have imagined to have been my mind in the paſſage he cites, having been my anſwer in a Sermon at *Bewdley* to this very objection of the Parſon there in the pulpit, of which I can hardly think Mr. *B.* to have been ignorant. Other conſiderations of the time of printing that book might have occaſioned M. *B.* to have put that conſtruction on my words, were he or any of my Antagoniſts willing to give my words or actions their due interpretation. The other paſſages condemne me not till I be proved *an agent for ſeparation, ſeedeſman of tares*: which Mr. *B.* cannot prove, though he tells me pag. 188. *he hath as good evidence that I am a Sect-Maſter as that I am a Chriſtian, becauſe I preach, diſpute, talke, and endeavor as zealouſly to promote my opinion as I do for the Chriſtian Faith.* To which I anſwer, my opinion is no other then the command of Chriſt, and if we ſpeak according to ſcripture, to preach for baptiſme of believers is to preach for Chriſtian faith. 2. Yet I deny that I preach with a like zeal for that particular point as for greater points of repentance from dead works, & faith towards God in Chriſt incarnate, dead; riſen, aſcended, to come again, &c. my *Bewdley* auditors beſides others will I doubt not witneſſe againſt this calumny. 3. But were it true that I did preach ſo zealouſly for my opinion, yet ſith my actions tend not to make a party to follow me, but only endeavour to reform a corruption like thoſe our Saviour oppoſeth *Mat.* 23. *Mark* 7. there is no ſhew of making a ſect in my actions, though I were miſtaken in them. The paſſage from the ſame treatiſe pa. 103. concerning *an Hypocrites falling foully*, doth not juſtify his expoſition of *Mat.* 7. 16. It proves we oft know an hypocrite by his actions, it is nothing at all to prove a falſe prophet by his evil manners. The other two

paſſages

passages yield him no advantage for his proving infants disciples from *Acts* 15. 10. but are against him. For his proof lies on this, *That the yoke was put on Infants, and nothing was put on them but circumcision:* but those passages speak of the ordinances of the Jewes, and with circumcision all the legal ceremonies. If Mr. *B.* mean more by the *yoke*, *Acts* 15. 10. as the doctrines and commands, sure the Teachers did not put that on them till they taught them, which was not in infancy. And therefore my words will not help him as will appear in the examining his first argument. All hitherto produced by him, though by his placing it in the forefront he seems to have made account of it, is but paper-shot, *brutum fulmen, a crack without force.* I go on to the Epistles.

SECT. V.

Mr. B. unduely suggests many things in his Epistles.

AS for the Epistle to the people of *Kederminster*, I rejoice with him in their unity, excepting wherein they agree against the truth; I think if they will use their understandings, as they should, they will find more reason to be unsettled in the point of infant-baptism, by Mr. *Bs.* book then to be settled by it, and that they had little cause of a solemne thanksgiving for Mr. *Bs.* mannaging the dispute. My exceptions against his *Aphorismes of Justification* are communicated to him. I wish his life may continue to Gods glory, and the good of his people, and particularly that he may undeceive whom he hath deceived by his dispute and this book. In his Epistle to the people of *Bewdley* he mentions *a flame of error and discord at* Bewdley *blown by my breath, and that he came to quench it by the importunity of their Magistrate, Minister, and many of their people.* And his words are often enforced with such aggravating expressions, as make people specially afarre off imagine, that at *Bewdley* there is a great schisme and discord made by my preaching; whereas there was no such discord as I know of: yea I think afore the dispute the godly did walk together in publique hearing, publique and private prayer, and conference while I was with them and since, as lovingly as in any other places. And though all do not joine in breaking of bread, some going to the Parson, others declining him as a stranger to the private meetings of the godly, and an adversary to such godly preachers as from time to time they

they had gotten for the Chappel, and a temporizer with the kings party while the Town was under their power went to Mr. *B.* to *Kederminster*, others being baptized have joined with me: yet all of them meet together for repetition and conference, and when I am with them I think in greater number then in my absence, and do embrace my doctrine with lesse breaking out into *Antinomian*, *Familistical*, *Ranting* errors or practises then at *Kederminster*. The discord of most note hath been between two men and their wives, who were by consent or connivence of their husbands baptized, and brake bread with us, till Mr. *Bs.* book came forth: which charging us with schism for reforming our selves, and affrighting people with the danger of our way as leading to error they are kept from our society; which is a manifest separation to avoid an imaginary, of which Mr. *B.* is the chief author; and I may truly say if there be any such flame of discord at *Bewdley*, as Mr. *B.* meanes, it is blown by Mr. *Bs.* breath, not mine, who am conscious to my self of being as studious of unity (as I can, with preservation of truth. As for my kindling errour) I fear I have done lesse then I should have done, not meddling with the point of *Antipadobaptisme*, but as it fell in my way in my cursory exposition on *Gen.* 17. wherein I only vindicated my self from Mr. *Robert Bayly* his false Criminations of me about the Covenant there, and overthrew the suppositions of *Pedobaptists* from thence about the Covenant and initial seale, and once or twice more on the by, till by occasion of the motioned dispute between me and Mr. *B.* I saw it was fit I should in some sermons open the controversy, which was not till *Decemb.* 1649. presently after which my return to *Lemster* was concluded. The Magistrate a stranger to the meetings of the Godly in their houses, the Minister (such as he is) for his credit, and others of somewhat a like stamp it is likely did invite Mr. *B.* to oppose me as they had done their Schoole master to make use of their abilities to uphold their *Dagon* of Infant-sprinking: but Mr. *Bs.* abuse of Scriptures so palpably impertinent, his mannaging the dispute with reasonings of wit, and other carnal waies do assure me he had no call from God. His alleadging *Gal.* 2. 11, 14. to justifie his sharpnesse in dealing with me is invalid to that end there being no such dissimulation used by me, nor error maintained by me; Mr. *Bs.* opinion comes neerer *Peters Judaizing* then mine.

Sect. VI.

The chief points of Mr. Bs. Book are very briefly touched.

THe chief points in Mr. *Bs.* book he would have obſerved, in their places ſhall be (God willing) fully examined: For the preſent only thus much. My Confeſſion that all ſhould be admitted Church-members by baptiſme, was meant of ſuch as by their profeſſion are viſible, not of ſuch as are viſible in Mr. *Bs.* way without profeſſion. The repeal of the Law or ordinance for infants viſible Church-membership will be eaſily proved when the law or ordinance is ſhewed. As yet I can find no ſuch law or ordinance ſave what is injoyned concerning circumciſion; which if it ſtand in force, we muſt *keep the whole law, Gal.* 5. 3 His firſt challenge is anſwered by another challenge to ſhew what one church had infants viſible Church-members beſides the Jewes. His ſecond is anſwered by ſhewing till *Abrahams* time there is nothing ſaid about any church-frame; from *Abrahams* time till *Chriſts* the *Jewiſh* church-frame ſtood: In *Chriſts* time and the Apoſtles no other are reckoned to belong to the viſible Church, then profeſſors of faith. And ſo it continued till infants were admitted to baptiſm to ſave them, which out of the caſe of danger of preſent dying was diſſwaded by *Tertullian and Gregory Nazianzen.* Afterwards their baptiſme was more frequent through *Auſtins* urging it ſo much againſt the *Pelegians*, as *Strabo* rightly obſerved long ſince, & together with it infant-communion was common, yet not without the continuance of the old form of putting the queſtion to infants, after which at firſt profeſſion was declared, & catechizing moſtly afore they were baptized at certain ſeaſons of the year till ignorance and confuſion overſpread the Churches. But when God began to ſtirre up any to reform other corruptions, there were that ſought to reform this 500. years ago, according to truth, notwithſtanding Mr. *Bs.* Mr. *Ms.* or Doctor *Vſhers* allegations: of whom I perſwade my ſelf many may be met with in heaven notwithſtanding M. *Bs.* confident expreſſions to the contrary. Yet were all Mr. *B.* ſayes true, if I put Mr. *B.* to the like, as to ſhew me ſince the Apoſtles, one that queſtioned keeping of an Eaſter, Lent faſt, Infant-communion, Monkiſh profeſſion, &c. till the laſt age he will be hard put to it. His conſiderations depend upon the points in diſpute: in examining of which it may appear how frivolous his queſtions are. Infants Church-membership I find no where but in the peculiar national policy of the Jewes, no univerſal law or ordinance for it; the Jewiſh policy is taken away both *de facto* by the providence of God, and *de jure* of right by the

the declaration of Christ and his Apostles in the *N. T.* and by altering the way of Church-gathering and constitution. The Jewes were hainously offended at the taking away of circumcision, not because he took away Churchmembership of infants, but because of the taking away of the law of *Moses*, the Temple, Priesthood, &c in which they gloried, *Acts* 21.20,21. *Act* 6.13,14. If it be true, that it was a known truth, that infants were visible Church-members, and to be admitted Disciples, and the Apostles did not admit them, *Mat.* 19.13 (which Mr. *B.* suppoſeth) then the challenge is answered, *Name me away from the creation till* 200. *years ago, who did once queſtion infants Church-membership?* For after Mr. *Bs.* dictates the Apostles did so. Let men *turne over their Bibles*, they will finde enough in them against infants visible Church-membership in the *N. T.* He askes, *Why the ſpeech*, Marke 16.16. *which excludes infants from baptiſme, ſhould not alſo exclude them from ſalvation for want of believing?* To which I answer, It is not doubted but that infants belong to the invisible Kingdome of the Elect *Rom.* 9.11. *Mat.* 19.14. but how they attain salvation is not so certain: If by a seed of faith or holinesse without actual exercise, the thing is more easie to conceive: if by actual exercise extraordinarily and immediately wrought by the Holy Spirit, then the speeches, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, and the like, do exclude infants from salvation if not believing actually; if by vertue of election without any work on them, if by vertue of the Covenant their parents believing (which some assert, but I professe to know no such Covenant) then the speeches, *He that believeth not, ſhall be damned*, with the like, must be understood with this limitation, He of those to whom the Gospel is preached that believeth not shall be damned. For my part, I do much incline to that opinion, which conceives *Marke* 16.16. *John* 3.18. and such like, to be understood of belief & unbelief of those of years, who have the Gospel preached to them because the course of the context leads thereto. Which being premised, I answer to the question, That infants are excluded from baptisme from *Mat.* 28.19. *Marke* 16.15,16. compared together, because these texts shew that according to Christs institution, they that are to be baptized are to be Disciples or known professed believers, and baptisme belongs onely to whom Christ appoints it. Yet these texts do not exclude infants from salvation, because either it excludes professed unbelievers, not non-believers negatively from incapacity, or it excludes unbelievers that are in no sort believers, neither in the seed nor fruite, neither byordinary, nor by extraordinary operation; in one of which wayes infants

are

are or may be believers, and so not excluded by that text, if belief and unbelief comprehend all these wayes in that place. To his question, *What great comfort would follow this conclusion* [*that all your infants are out of Christs visible Church*] *that men should bend their wits so to prove it?* I answer, The question might be retorted, What great comfort would follow this conclusion [that all our infants are by nature children of wrath] that men should bend their wits so to prove it? 2. The answer I suppose Mr. *B.* would give to the one will fit us, that whether it be matter of comfort or discomfort, we must maintain truth. To another passage of his supposing, *That to be visibly in the Church is all one as* (*to our judgement*) *to belong to Christs Kingdome*, I answer by denying it, and doubt not to shew how this mistake hath much misled Mr. *B.* when I examine the 27. chap. of the *first part of his book*. We can prove that Christ will save his elect though no Christians in appearance, nor disciples by profession, nor visibly subjects of his Kingdome. Mr. *B.* talkes vainly of *the judgements of Gods Ministers and Churches in all ages of the world*, when as their judgement is proved by my writings to have been, and to be at this day so various about infant-baptisme, I have little hope to conceive Mr. *B.* by my writings, which he sleights so much as to say, *That the best part of my bookes is Ink and Paper*. Men not inferiour to Mr. *B.* and one I am sure farre beyond Mr. *B.* in disputes, judged otherwise. Were not Mr. *B.* mounted to an height of disdainful pride, me thinks he might have spied the clearing of some Scriptures, and other things more worth then the Ink and Paper. It is his uncharitable conceit of me, if he imagine *I write to have the last word*: it is to shew his grosse abuse of Scripture, and his fallacies of reasoning. If he out-live this answer I now am making, any time he may have the last word if he will for me, who am weary with meddling with such a distemper'd writer. *I blame not Mr. B. for printing*: but for printing my answers afore I had fitted them to his arguments in writing, as Doctor *Rainolds* dealt with *Harr*, which (saith he in *his preface to his conference with* Hart) *learned men have thought to be most fit for trial of truth, not by extemporal speaking, but writing with advise the question argued of, the arguments, the answers, the replies set down, and sifted of both sides till each had fully said; in fine, the whole published, that the Churches and the faithfull all may judge of it.* Such a rule was followed also *in the conference at the Hague*, and in all other profitable Colloquies about points in controversie; to all which Mr. *Bs.* dealing with me hath bin altogether unlike. Nor is he excused by telling me *he had a copy of my sermon, and had conference with me.* For besides other exceptions

ptions this excuſe takes not away, it is very apparent that neither in the diſpute nor in that conference his judgement about infants Diſcipleſhip and Church-viſibility, and other points in his book could be diſcerned ſo as to know determinately what to oppoſe. Which makes me glad of the publiſhing of his book however, though for the preſent I ſuffer much by it, nothing doubting but I ſhall be able to ſhew the wickedneſſe of his writing, ſo as that all that are willing may ſee, that whoſoever leanes on his arguments to juſtifie their infant-baptiſme, reſts on a broken reed that will run into his hands.

SECT. VII.

Many perſonall occurrences are cleered by relating of which Mr. B. hath in his Hiſtory ſought to create prejudice againſt me.

NExt to the two Epiſtles followes the *Hiſtory*, in which his deſigne ſeemes to be to vindicate himſelf from my accuſations, and to recriminate me. I ſhall here very briefly anſwer him about perſonal matters in the *Hiſtory* and elſewhere, that the Readers may onely have to do with arguments, and anſwers when they come to them. He ſpends ſome leaves to prove he did not inconſiderately and raſhly take up his opinion, as I accuſe him. Whereas I do not remember, that any where I accuſe him of raſhneſſe, but *Antidote* ſect. 7. *of inconſiderateneſſe and haſte* in that paſſage wherein he names Anabaptiſts in the plural, meaning me onely. Which whether he did or no it's not material: nor worth while to make reply to the deſcant of his *Corrective* on that paſſage in my *Antidote*. The next thing in his *Hiſtory* to which I am to anſwer is, that he chargeth me with both there, and in his anſwer to my *Valedictory Oration* page 209,210. *with falſehood, in telling them in the pulpit, that I could never know his arguments till the diſpute, that he hid his weapons till he meant to ſtrike, that I was ſet upon at a ſudden, that I had the arguments concealed from me aforehand: the contrary whereof was manifeſt in that he had urged the ſame argument at Col.* Taylors *houſe in London, that I had ſeen ſome notes of his in which the firſt was that which he urged at the diſpute, and therefore that I ſpake not truth, and it's an evidence his arguments are good in that I gave ſuch feeble anſwers to them.* To which I ſay, I do not think I ſaid I could never know his arguments till the

the disputes: I confesse the conference at Col. *Taylors* house 1646. and the reading of his arguments (as was said) 1647. but the conference being not written, nor the notes then in my hand, there were left onely some imperfect and obscure apprehensions of them in me, which in respect of giving a distinct answer were all one as if I knew them not at all: by reason of which I was very desirous to get his arguments in writing, that I might be the better able to answer them, and satisfie others; which Mr. *B.* not yielding to, I could not give answer, but on the sudden without premeditation the arguments being gone from me, like *Nebuchad-nezzars* dream, and I did imagine, and accordingly used these words in a letter, *It was said, you would hide your weapon till you were to use it*; In which opinion his taking hold of so many indirect ways for advantages to possesse mens minds with his opinion, and to hinder a free examination of what is said on both sides do confirme me. And that things may be apprehended nakedly as they were, I do acknowledge, that it is my disposition, be it dulnesse or wearinesse, to pause on a new argument whether in reading or conference, so that I cannot oft-times give a clear answer to an argument I have not bin used to on a sudden, no nor many times to an argument I have been versed in, when it is not under my eye, when other matters possesse my memory, when fear of speaking ineptly doth benumme me and hinder my elocution, when I have some obscure notion of a fallacy which at present I cannot readily discover. Which knowledge of my self made me unwilling to come to a publick dispute or extemporal conference with Mr. *B.* whom I had found in conferences I had with him to be quick in apprehension and expression, various and copious in multiplying arguments and expressions, captious of advantages, ready to expose even to contempt, with shew of disdain, those that speak not according to his mind, which made me conceive I should neither well remember, nor weigh his arguments afore I must answer, nor clear truth, nor satisfie my self or others, but occasion glorying in Mr. *B.* and settling people in his error. Nevertheless presaging by his declining to argue by writing and his words in his letter *Sept.* 6. [*if I should refuse a conference (called before an open verbal dispute) on such advantages I should think it were almost to yield my cause naught*] that it would be taken as if I did confesse I could not answer him, after much endeavour in vain to get his arguments in writing that I might consider of them before the dispute, I yielded to be ready to justifie my doctrine openly or privately by word or writing, as should be judged convenient. Whereupon Mr. *B.* having drawn me to agree upon *Jan.* 1. 1649 without any agreement about stating the question, order or rules of the dispute, notaries on both sides to set down

what

what was said people being gathered together from other places by his party, and a place in state prepared for him with his abettors, schollers and others on both sides him, I my self alone without any notary or assistant was forced to answer him prepared in this unexpected manner, lest I should have endammaged the cause by seeming tergiversation; yet presuming that I should have found such dealing after by communicating to me in writing his arguments afore printing, or at lest forbearing to print my answers till I had viewed and rectified them, that might have repaired what seeming disadvantage the truth had by my present answers: in which I found my selfe extreamly deceived, my motion of having his arguments in writing after the dispute being answered by quarrelling with me about things on the by, and in a subdolous and indirect way filling the land with conceits as if his tenet and arguments were unanswerable, and I a person pertinarious without reason. By this true relation the truth of my intimation of the suddenness of the assault, my ignorance of his arguments, my speeches concerning his concealing his arguments, provoking me to dispute are verified, the reasons of my desiring his arguments in writing, the cause of varying my answers at the dispute, and why to so weake arguments no fuller answers were then given, and why I said at *Bewdley* (which I still think) I preached nothing but truth to them, are assigned: about all which Mr. *B.* hath endeavoured to misrepresent me and my proceedings in his *History of the conception of his Treatise*. As for Mr. *Bs. inclination now to think me a very proud man* however he thought heretofore, and that I have *higher thoughts of my self then was meete, because of my dissent from so many Churches and God'y Divines*, and because of my answer in private to him about the reason I gave why the error of infant-baptisme being easie to be discerned was not discerned through wilfulnesse or negligence, I say 1. My dissent is not singular, nor my reasons and writings such but that such a one as my self might be allowed to hold my tenet without imputations of selfe-conceitednesse, arrogance, &c. Mr. *B.* varies from Churches and learned men about justification and faith in his *Aphorismes*: what he can say for himself why he should not be censured as he censures me may perhaps be my plea. I cannot alter my own judgement or others but by arguments, nor dare I say I do see what I do not. 2. As for my speech in private (which me thinks it was somewhat against the lawes of friendship for him thus to publish) I know not what better answer yet to give, but to ascribe it to prejudice, or faction or some such like cause that men are so wilful or negligent as not to examine and discerne the errour of infant-baptism so manifestly discernable by applying to it their own rules

and positions in reformation of Popish and Prelatical corruptions. And I do conceive the same or like answer would be given about the Lutherans holding consubstantiation, images to be retained in Temples, ubiquity of Christs body, conditional predestination, and sundry the like tenets: which may be a just censure without pride. That which Mr. *B.* saies, [*And lest my touching that controversy though at a distance might irritate him to fall upon it, I never spake one word (to my best remembrance) in my congregation of it to this day, for fear of giving any occasion of difference* page 209. *I never preached one sentence before the disputes, nor since to his hearers or mine that I can remember on the question.* Page 281. *I never spake one word against his opinion in my pulpit to this day*] shewes his memory retaines not all he printed in his *Saints everl isting rest*, preached on the Lecture-dayes at *Kederminster*. As page 534. *We should see the promises made good to our seed, and the unthankful Anabaptists, that will not confesse, That the children of the Saints are any nearer to God or more beholding to him then Pagans, so much as for the favour to be visible Church-members, should by sweet experience be convinced of their errour, and be taught better how to understand that all our children are holy.* Page 518. He calls the disputes about baptism *perverse and fierce*, which did so directly touch the controversy as might irritate me to fall on it at *Bewdly*, and make those that told me think he did gird at me, which he denies pag. 166. He mentions a speech of mine to Mr. *D.* whom he terms *a godly man* [*that truth is not to be suspended for peace*] and saith, *When the times changed* (which his words page 220. intimet to be meant, *When the ordinance against heresies and errors ceased to be in force*) *I spake against Infant-sprinkling, perswaded them to be baptized again, mentioned in Sermons Mr.* M. *Mr.* Blake, *and himself, when my doctrine prevailed not* (*though since I have gotten above* 20. *rebaptized disciples, whom I often visit and confirm*) *that I charged them with hypocrisy, with their blood on their heads, that M.* Ms. *plea from circumcision for infant-baptism is heresie, that by my definition of heresy Independants must be judged Hereticks, that I sought his arguments in writing to put them in my Review of the dispute with Mr.* M. *and to engage him in the Controversy; whence he gathered I was unpeaceable, set to carry on my opinion, and to make my self a party.* To all this I reply. 'Tis true some conceiving Mr. *B.* in his speeches had a fling at me, and it seeming likely to me, I did speak to the purpose Mr. *B.* saies I did, not imagining that a speech upon a conference in a shop without its limitations and cautions should have been (as it is by Mr. *B.*) published and refuted

futed as my error: but indeed willing only that Mr. *B.* should know, that in my case I was not to suspend my asserting of truth for fear of losing of peace, as I alleadge in my *Apology* sect. 3. And I professe I wonder that such as Mr. *M.* Mr. *B.* and others that were so earnest against *Bishops* and ceremonies though warres did follow, and had a great hand in putting them on, should now, the warres being so well abated, be so impatient that Infant-sprinkling is questioned. It is untruely surmised that the charge of times was the cause of my opening my self fully in the congregation at *Bewdley*. My first meddling with it was when Mr. *Bayly* had so unjustly charged me in his *Anabaptisme* chap. 4. page 92. with *spoiling infants of all interest in the Covenant of grace, making circumcision a scale to the Jewes only of earthly priviledges, denying to the Jewish infants all right to the Covenant till in their riper years they become actual believers.* Which with other false accusations about twenty in that one page I intreated by letter my dear Father-in-Law Mr. *Henry Studd.r* to advertise him of: after that I might stand right in the thoughts of that worthy man Mr. *William Hopkins* of *Bewdley* (now with God) I shewed him how he wronged me, and then cleared my self in my cursory exposition on *Gen.* 17. brought his book with me into the pulpit, and read a passage of Mr. *Ms. Defence* part. 3. page 98. for my vindication, which was presently sent up to London. But Mr. *Bayly* doing nothing to right me, I wrote to Mr. *Bayly*, and because Mr. *Rutherford* had my letter to send to him, I wrote since to him to know what became of my letter, but have had no answer. After this I was moved to preach what I did (which was but little till *December* 1649.) when I found my tenet on the day of fast to be humbled for blasphemies and heresies (which was as I remember *March* 10. 1649.) reckoned as by others so by Mr. *Obadiah Sedgewick* in his *Sermon before the Lords among heresies*, (with which I found afterwards the *censure of* 52. *Ministers about London to concurre* stigmatizing me by name as holding *four pernicious errors in my Examen*) and when the ordinance against blasphemy and heresie was published; which Mr. *Boraston* though not required, yet published at *Ribsford* (to which *Bewdley Chappel* relates) that he might proclaime me an Heretick. Which necessitated me to speak what I did, not *the change of times* (it's known I spake as much in the hardest times to my opinion as since) nor *unpeaceableness in me*, as Mr. *B.* surmised. What I preached was in no clamourous manner (as Mr. *B.* would intimate, calling it *exclaiming*) but in a way of proof and answer as sober Divines do in the like case. My naming any was when I recited their words, for which though I was reviled

once in *London* when refuting Doctor *Crisp* I named him, and Mr. *B.* in a letter to me, and since in print reckons as no small fault, yet I ever did, and do still think it to be necessary, when the books are in mens hands, and the Auditors are not likely otherwise to know we recite their opinion truly, nor whose error we refute. I do not believe I used those words Mr. *B.* sets down as mine [*Let them budge at it, &c.*] though it's likely I might say, it's one of the chiefest signes of sincerity to embrace every truth, and hypocrisy not to receive it for carnal respects; not out of anger that men were not of my mind, but to justify my self after I had fully handled the point about baptism (which I think was either after or immediately before the dispute) I used the Apostles words, *Act.* 20. 26, 27. nor do I deny that sith our Lord Christ doth, *Mark* 16. 16. make baptisme some condition of Salvation, I think those that are taught that Infant-sprinkling is not the duty Christ requires of being baptized, and that water baptisme of men at years upon profession of faith is a necessary duty (which I had sufficiently proved at *Bewdley*) and yet neglect it, do hazzard their salvation living in disobedience to a manifest duty, yea the prime duety whereby they ought solemnly to engage themselves to be Christs Disciples. I have *gotten no Disciples to me*, and though more then 20 in *Bewdley* have bin baptized after profession of faith since my removal from them (whom with the whole Town I think my self bound by many ties as often as I may to visit and confirm) yet not rebaptized. It is true to shew how unreasonable the accusation of my tenet as heresy is, I have sundry times said that Mr. *Ms.* position in his *Sermon* page 35. [*That all Gods commands and institutions about the Sacraments of the Jewes bind us as much as they did them, in all things which belong to the substance of the Covenant, and were not accidentall unto them*] is one of the most manifest heresies being condemned, *Acts* 15. For it expressely asserts that the Gentile Christians are still bound to some rule of circumcision, contrary to the Apostles determination. Nor did I *frame a definition of heresie to make good what I said of Mr. Ms. tene*, though I deny not the definition I gave with some explication of my meaning: of which what Mr. *B.* hath in his *Corrective* page 259, 260. is not much short. Mr. *Bs.* inference thereupon that *by my definition Independents are Hereticks*, followes not. For though they erre, yet that they make a party for their error is unknown to me: although weary of alteration with Mr. *B.* as acquainted with his temper I replyed not. If I desired Mr. *Bs.* animadversions on my writings, that I might see all worth answering and put it in my *Review*, it was no more unreasonable in me to desire then in Mr. *B.* to desire the like afore his reprinting his *Aphorisms*,

phoriſmes, nor any more folly in him to have gratifyed me then; then in others to gratifie him with the like; but had been a very friendly & neighbourly part in him to one, who was very glad to gratify him or his neighbours in any thing meet for me, as I deny not (excepting this) he and his neighbours were to gratify me. After his denial of his animadverſions I think I came to his Lecture ſundry times though not ſo often as formerly, becauſe of my much abſence from *Bewdly*. To conclude, Mr. *B.* found me not *adverſe to the Churches peace*, but only his uncharitable ſurmiſes imagined me ſo. And I deſire the Reader to take notice that in all this he chargeth me with, there is no one act of ſeparation from whence he ſhould conclude ſo hardly of me as he doth.

SECT. VIII.

More perſonal matters which the Hiſtory of Mr. B. hath made crooked are ſet ſtraight.

THe next part of the Hiſtory is about the occaſion and mannaging of the diſpute, to moſt of which an anſwer may be gathered out of my letter to him *Sept.* 10. of which ſo much as is needful is printed at the end of this writing. To call being baptized in the name of Chriſt *Apoſtaſie*, contrary to the Ancients language, and in effect to call white black. Diviſions that happen, if the ſaddle be put on the right horſe, are to be charged on them that oppoſe the reformation of the corruption of infant-ſprinkling. I think I anſwered Mr. *Bs.* letter ſufficiently in mine of *Sept.* 10. 1649. If I had a deſigne to anſwer his arguments in my *Review* it had been an honeſt deſigne, and hanſomer then Mr. *Bs.* printing my anſwers to his arguments afore he had them from me in writing. Sith Mr. *B.* is unwilling to be put in the crowd among the reſt he ſhall have an anſwer (ſo far as it is fit) by himſelf, that he may not complain of being ſleighted by being yoked with the vulgar. My dealings with Mr. *M.* were ſuch as none can juſtly except againſt. Perſonal things were fully anſwered in my *Apology*: the diſpute it ſelf at large I reſerved for the *Review*: onely ſect. 15. I gave arguments to prove *Rom.* 11. 17. &c. to be meant of ingraffing by giving faith into the inviſible Church, and ſect. 16, 17. pointed at ſome of the chief things

wherein

wherein Mr. Ms. *defence* was defective. I professed not a full answer to Mr. *Bl.* &c. but gave short advertisements in my *Postscript* with reasons why I did so, which I yet count sufficient for answer to that piece, however Mr. *B.* imagine of it. *I slubber'd over* nothing (as Mr. *B.* and one Mr. *George Milward in a letter to one Capt. Freeman* charge me). If I do not write so quick as Mr. *B.* Mr. *M.* &c. it is from my unsettled condition, ministeriall imployments, the multitude of them that write against me, though I earnestly intreated that I might see the strength of all together, (which motion had been fit for them that were desirous to have truth take place, and not make use of advantages to hinder the cleering of it) the difficulty and charge of printing, which Mr. *B.* can easily perhaps have done, people being averse from the truth I hold, and willing to sell or buy or reade any thing against me, but not what is for me. That in my *Sermons at Bewdley I culled out the weakest arguments*, is most false: to the best of my skill I produced the best arguments I met with in their strength, and as much as I could in the Authors words. Mr. *Cobbets* book being a loose discourse for the most part, having many passages, and expressions proper to the way of *N. E.* filled with dictates unproved, much of it against *J. S. H. D.* &c. whose speeches and arguments I am not engaged to maintain, I do not bind my self to answer. If I might be allowed to passe my judgement freely, notwithstanding Mr. *Cottons*, Mr. *Thomas Goodwins*, and Mr. *Bs.* conceits of it, I should say, that I do not perceive in the matter of it any such strength as needs much answering, and that the method and expressions are such as that it cannot well be answered without lopping off many superfluous branches, enquiring into his meaning in many of his expressions which are cloudy (which would be extreamly tedious to the answerer and reader, and liable to much exception) and reducing it into a more scholastical forme; were it by himself shaped into a succinct treatise like Mr. *Nortons* to *Apollonius*, and should be willing to answer it, if I found any thing in it, which I had not answered before: But I would not have the Reader expect me to answer that again, which in some of my writings is formerly answered, and in which he might by reading heedfully satisfie himself: Yet I did answer the chief of his arguments in those Sermons, and I intend to answer what else I meet with in them, that is opposed to my *Examen*, and what ever else I shall conceive is necessary to be answered. I little expected to satisfie Mr. *B.* who I found had prejudice in him, which was not denied by him. Mr. *B.* name was used with respect onely in citing his words in his *Aphorismes*, which I never dreamt would be taken for an injury. His censuring mens writings and confuting them in pulpit without naming them

or

or citing their words as it is lesse offensive, so it is lesse edifying. Mr. *Br.* prosperity and my conceived failings at the dispute (which will appear to be Mr. *Bs.* mistakes in the answer of his arguments in print) were ordered by the Almighties providence for humbling me, and discovery of Mr. *Bs.* spirit then (which must be refereed to the judgment of the hearers) and since (which Readers may perceive) yet I hope according to the strange windings of his providence, as in *Josephs* case, for the advancement of the truth he oppoſeth. The Miniſters about Mr. *B.* at the diſpute were all of Mr. *Bs.* party ſent for up and down all the Countrey, ſuch as they were, if they may be reputed Miniſters, or men that mind the things of Chriſt; of whom no marvel Mr. *B.* was cried up, I taunted with dulneſſe, it ſerving for their ends to keep up their eſteeme: one or two of better account ſate further off, yet of Mr. Bs. judgement. That I did not hearken to Mr. *Barrſtons* motion for Mr. Bs. preaching, it was becauſe I knew it would be likely to ſtirre up paſſion, and ſettle prejudice in the people (in which I find by that he hath printed chap. 1. 2. eſpecially in the very beginning I was not miſtaken) and I hoped to bring the diſpute to writing, which is the beſt way to clear truth, and I ſuſpected (as I had cauſe) Mr. *Barrſtons* and the then *Magiſtrates, and thoſe reputed godly perſons* devices and motions, which were then by many conceived to be contrived for the Parſons endes, the continuing his power and profits by keeping up that rite which ingratiates the profane and formal perſons to him. Whereunto that Mr. *B.* hath been ſubſervient is the grief of many, and might well befit Mr. *B.* to repent of. When I ſaw I could not get Mr. *Bs.* arguments in writing, I got what notes I could of the diſpute from others writing or my own memory; and knowing that vauntes were given out of Mr. *Bs.* victory, I did as well as I could ſumme up his arguments, and anſwer them *Jan.* 20. and after went to him upon his motion *Jan.* 25. to confer with him, which was friendly on both ſides; yet that which I hoped and I conceived he promiſed, that though he would not ſend me his arguments in writing (which I again moved) yet he would tranſcribe them for ſuch as ſhould come to him to be reſolved in that point, after ſundry puttings off was not obtained: But inſtead thereof in *March* the weeke afore I removed from *Bewdley* I met with the paſſage in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to the people of *Kedermiſter*, to which I after oppoſed my *Valedictory Oration in* Bewdley *chappel* March. 17. 1649. and printed the ſame in effect in my *Antidote* in *May* following. Now Mr. *B.* 41. leadgeth *he had reaſon for his not ſending his arguments to me to keep me from erring they being not deſired, for my ſelf, but my people, I remained very confident of my ſelf, that when I ſent to him I heap'd ſo many untruths*

truths about matters of fact I knew, that he durſt not anſwer me leſt the very naming my untruths might cauſe me to ſay, he reproached or railed, that his conference was with me in private, becauſe he thought my pride of ſpirit would not permit me to confeſſe truth openly, that he wrote the paſſage in his Epiſtle to Kederminſter *out of zeale for God, compaſſion to mens ſouls, my opinion and preaching being like to do more hurt againſt the Church of God, then drunkards and whoremongers, and therefore he had cauſe to be bitter in his writing.* To all which ſpeeches I reply, He had reaſon to conceive I deſired ſatisfaction for my ſelf by my deſiring his Animadverſions, and by my letter to him *Sept.* 10. If not, yet to have given them in writing, which he had as he ſaies before, at *Coventrey* preached and were ready by him, had been a neighbourly part to men that were his frequent hearers. But his prejudice againſt my opinion and uncharitable conceit of my pride (as heretofore Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Ley* interpreted my moſt equal motion in humility of ſpirit in the end of my *Examen* to be the challenge of a *braving Goliath*, ſo now any oppoſing what's determined by Synods and leading writers muſt be condemned as comming from pride) are a ſufficient reaſon not to gratify me, but to do what he can againſt me, and this muſt be counted zeale for God, and his inſolent bitterneſſe juſtifiable, as being in pretence againſt a pernicious ſin not yet proved, but indeed againſt a truth diſcovering an error, whereby the prime ordinance of Chriſtianity is miſerably corrupted. He ſpeaks of a *fearful paſſion a feaver of paſſion I was in when I firſt read the paſſage in his Epiſtle againſt Anabaptiſts, ſuch as he would not be in for all my revenues, if I had not a free vent for my ſpleen in pulpit and preſſe he doubts it might have ſpoiled me.* 'Tis true when I firſt read it unexpectedly in Mr. *Ds.* houſe, I was ſtirred in my ſpirit out of the ſenſe of the wrong done to me and the truth by it, and not meeting with the book before, I wrote out the paſſage: but that by word of carriage I ſhewed ſuch paſſion as he ſpeaks of I am certain is his tale-tellers addition, whoſe conſcience may perhaps one day tell him of his ill Offices in oppoſing truth, and nourſhing differences between me and Mr. *B.* Mr. *B.* hath a jerke at *my Revenues*, by which he would have the world believe it is very great, and ſuch as were deſirable for himſelf: whereas his outward eſtate conſidering his being an unplundered, or not much plundered ſingle young man heir of a good eſtate in Land, beſides his ſequeſtration is more likely to ſuffice his uſes then my eſtate my uſes, though I bleſſe God it is better with me through the favour of ſome eminent perſons ſenſible of my hard uſuage, then it would have been if the party oppoſite to me had prevailed, and I could

rea-

reasonably hope; when for no other cause but the publishing of my *Examen* my remove from the *Temple* in *London* with my wife and children above a hundred miles in the middest of winter was necessitated. Not content with this jerke, about my reverence is page 202. He tells me in print of being *Parson of Rosse, Vicar of Lemster, Preacher of Bewdley, Master of the Hospital of Ledbury, besides meanes of my own, and yet complaining of want I and my family might be put to in my bookes*, and he addes, *You made small light of having no lesse then four market-townes to lie on your shoulders as if it were nothing, and then saith Pious sober men think it his duty to say what he did.* To which I reply. Mr. *M.* is taken for a *pious sober man*, yet in his *Defence* of his *sermon* page 3. he accused me most deeply of a *Socinian plot of questioning all conclusions inferr'd by consequence from scripture*; the injury of which I shewed in my *Apology* sect. 11. yea his own words in his *Defence* pag. 265. *You neither there nor here deny this argument from a consequence to be sufficient for practice of some things in the worship of God, which are not expressely laid down in the N.T.* refute this calumny, yet to this day I never found that he did any thing to right me. The like may I say of Mr. *Robert Baillie of Glasgow in Scotland* notwithstanding his false criminations before mentioned, and my writing to him about them. How Mr. *Geree* used me is shewed in my *Apology* sect. 6. yet his *Vindiciæ vindiciarum* was presently after published without any shew of remorse of conscience for what he did. And now Mr. *B.* tells me, *pious and sober men advise him to say* that which as he puts it down is false and exceeding injurious to me, to wit, *that I had foure market-townes on my shoulders*, which every one will interpret to be 4. beneficial places under my charge together, *besides meanes of my own, and yet complain in my bookes of want I and my family may be put to.* Whereas the truth is, there are no words that have a shew of complaint (which yet indeed are not querulous but onely narrative) but those in the close of my *Examen* and *Apology*, and neither of them, when I enjoyed any thing at *Lemster*, *Bewdley*, *Rosse* or *Ledbury*; but the former was *anno* 1644. when all my estate was in the enemies power, and my small stipend at *Hanchurch* withdrawn by reason of my not practising Infant-baptisme; the other when I was to leave the Temple for publishing my *Examen anno* 1646. when the Counties to which I had relation, were but newly reduced to the obedience of the *Parliament*. And then I assayed to returne to *Lemster*, where I had been almost totally plundred *anno* 1642. and yet so great was the Antipathy of some men against me, that I could neither get reparation for my losses, nor allowance for building

the Ministers house, nor any augmentation, but onely kept the bare title till the end of the year 1649. 'Tis true some pittying my condition gave me the rent of the rectory of *Rosse* anno 1646. which having a Vicar endowed, and the Rectory leased out with the Rectors house, they gave it me with expectation of preaching only some sermons there as I could; but being invited to *Bewdley* I accepted of the invitation, and though the maintenance were but small, and the years dear, and my charges great in refurnishing my house and study, yet I rested contented therewith till the Deane and Chapter of *Worcesters* landes being to be sold, out of which the best part of my maintenance did arise, the providence of God cast on me the Mastership of the Hospital of *Ledbury*, which doth not tie me to the charge of soules, much lesse puts the market-towne on my shoulders, and then presently I yielded up my interest in *Rosse* though some of the godly there were very unwilling I should. And when my pay ended at *Bewdley* the Lord opened a way for my retume to *Lemster*, and provision was made for me there. By which it may appear, that it is most injuriously suggested as if I had 4. beneficial places together, *yea 4. market-townes on my shoulders*, and those that know not the truth imagine me very covetous, and my revenues very great, not knowing my condition what it is and what my losses have been. Me thinks when the people of *Bewdley*, *Rosse*, *Lemster*, were all satisfied (so farre as I could discerne) with the equity of my actions, Mr. *B.* and those other he meanes might have been so likewise, and possibly had been an Assembly-man it would have beene no disparagement to me to have been a Master of a House in the University, to have had a Lecture at *London*, a sequestration or presentation in the Countrey, besides pay for sitting in the Assembly at the same time: but might have in Mr. *Bs.* bookes bin stiled nevertheless *a learned, holy, experimental, judicious, humble, heart-piercing Preacher*. I cannot but be sensible of the great wrong I receive in my name, and perhaps in my estate by Mr. *Bs.* calumnies; and therefore am necessitated to write this which I conceive had been fitter for private audience. I do not take on me to know Mr. *Bs.* heart: but I wish Mr. *B.* would consider of what spirit he was, when he vented his jerk at my revenues, and whether the phrases *of offering a sacrifice to* Mars, *and keeping holy-daies for killing the Saints* in his Epistle to the people of *Kederminster* likely is a most profane, and bitter passage. His quip. pag. 67. *members of this Kingdome, or (to please you) Common-wealth* pag. 136. *of baptizing naked maides in Bewdley* pag. 245. *your feete will take cold or your heart heat*, &c. savour not more of an heathen Satyrists vain wit, then a Christian Preachers zealours spirit. He

saith

saith *that he perceives by one passage in my Antidote* pag. 21. *I am offended at him for diminishing my esteeme: for I complain, &c.* But the words there are no complaint, and if I imagined a mistake I am sorry that I did so surmise.

SECT. IX.

In my alleading Peter de Bruis *and others as Antipaedobaptists* 500. *years ago, is no untruth.*

BUt there is a foule sin Mr. *B.* chargeth me with when he saith in his History *my reports are untruths*, and page 176. he chargeth me *with very many palpable grosse untruths which I either knew or might to be so.* Two he hath selected as most remarkable: The first is, *That the lying Papists do accuse the Albigenses and Waldenses (our first reformers) to be witches, Buggerers, Sorcerers, and to deny infant-baptisme, &c. now what doth Mr. T. but perswade the world, that the Papists accusations of these so were true in this, &c. Is it railing to say, that this dealing is starke brazen-faced and unconscionable:* and after he stiles it *horrible foulnesse of dealing with other* words, *He that dare do this what dare he not? &c.* And page 201. *A most unconscionable Jesuitical trick to seduce poor ignorant soules.* To which I answer, My words *Examen* part. 2. sect. 2. tend to prove, that there were some that opposed Infant-baptisme 500. years ago, who were both godly men, and had godly societies joined with them: nor do I see cause to recede from the same opinion notwithstanding what either Doctor *Usher*, Mr. *M.* or Mr. *B.* have said to the contrary. I do no where charge the *Waldenses*, but onely cite in my *Examen* part. 2. sect. 2. *Cassanders*, and *Osianders* words in my *Exercit.* of the *Albigenses*. But let us consider what is brought to the contrary, 1. for *Berengarius*, *Deodrinus*, *Leodiensis* took it up as a common fame. 2. *It is not found charged in Synods against him.* 3. *That it appears to Doctor* Usher, *they who were charged in those dayes to hold that baptisme did not profit to salvation held nothing but this, That baptisme doth not conferre grace by the work wrought.* Yet *Durandus Leodicensis* in the 3d. *tome of the Bibliotheca patrum the last book in his Epistle to* Henry *King of* France makes it *such a fame as filled all their eares, praiseth the King of* France *for calling a Counsel against him*

and Bruno *by reason of it.* Nor are Doctor *Ushers* words as Mr. *M.* recites them, that *it appeared to him*, but *nec aliud videntur negaviſſe, &c.* Which is leſſe then to ſay it appeared to him. And for his conjecture it may be anſwered by another conjecture, that it ſeems rather *Berengarius* did at firſt diſcerne the vanity of infants baptiſme as ariſing from *Auſtins* errour about the neceſſity of it, and not much uſed till after his daies: yet finding the oppoſition of the corporal preſence in the Euchariſt too hard a buſineſſe being forced to recant by *Pope Nicholas*, it's likely he concealed his opinion of infant-baptiſme; to which conjecture *Caſſanders* conceit in his preface to the *Duke of Gulick and Cleves* before his *Teſtimonies for infant-baptiſme* is ſomewhat like, *That though he overthrew baptiſm of little ones, yet he brought it not into publique, becauſe as* Guitmund *ſaies, He knew, That the eares of the worſt men would not brook That blaſphemy.* I alſo related a ſpeech of the ſame *Caſſander* concerning the *Albigenſes*, beſides which in my *Exercitation* I alleadged the words of *Lucas Oſiander* accuſing the *Albigenſes* as agreeing with *Anabaptiſts.* And to ſhew that there was ſome reaſon for what I averred, to wit that there were others that made head againſt infant-baptiſme before *Balthaſar Pacimontanus*, I alleadged *Bernard Serm. 66. in Cantica. Epiſt.* 240. to *Hildeſonſus Earle of St. Giles*, *Petrus Cluniacenſis* his *Epiſtle to three Biſhops of France*, and in my *Antidote* ſect. 9. *Eckbertus Schonangienſis* his ſeventh *Sermon adverſus Catharos* in *Auctario Biblioth. Patrum tom.* 2. Againſt theſe allegations Mr. *M.* excepts and Mr. *B.* lets flie at me as before: neither deny that I rightly cite the Authors. But 1. *That the Authors were lying Papiſts.* 2. *That no impartial Authors ſo charge them.* 3. *That they did bely them in other things.* 4. *That upon report theſe with other things were charged on them.* 5. *That the Councels charge them not with this.* 6. *That other Hiſtorians charge not the Waldenſes.* 7. *That their confeſſions acquit them.* 8. *That I do but joine with malicious Papiſts to take up any the falſeſt ſlander to defend my cauſe by it.* For anſwer hereto I will not return railing for railing, but this I ſay and leave it to indifferent men (if there be any) to judge between us whether of us be in the right. *Caſſander* was never accounted, that I ever read, one of thoſe railing lying Papiſts Mr. *B.* mentions; but as impartial a man as any Papiſt living in his time. *Maximilian* the ſecond Emperour who favoured Proteſtants more then any Emperour prized him. His ſtudy was reconciliation and a middle way, which Mr. *B.* profeſſeth to be his. Mr. *B.* page 261. ſaith, *He ſpake the beſt of all parties that he might diſpleaſe none: Bernard*

is

is by Mr. *B.* himself page 265. stiled a *pious man*. *Petrus Cluniacensis* was though a zealous Papist, yet thought fit by *Illyricus* to be reckoned among *Witnesses of Truth* in his *Catalogue*. They are as impartial Authors (specially *Bernard*) as that age yielded; if these be not taken for witnesses of things in their times, I know not how Protestants will make up their Catalogue of witnesses for them in all ages. Protestant writers do frequently alledge these very Authors for other things. *Morney* in his *Mysterie of Iniquity progress.* 46. cites these very writings against Papists. I conceive Mr. *M.* Mr. *B.* think they said true, when *Bernard* charged them that they *derided prayer for the dead, invocation of Saints, Purgatory*: and *Cluniacensis* that they *excepted against Altars, adoring of Crosses, the Masse, chanting in quires, praying for the dead*. If they be to be believed in so many, why not in this, which they put first? *Lucas Osiander Epit. Hist. Eccl. vent.* 12. lib. 3. cap. 3. *anno Christi* 1158. cites *Cluniacensis* for the same thing. *Eckbertus* saith when he was *Canon at* Bon *he with his Companion* Bertoly *did often speak with them whom he refutes, sayes in his Sermon that they alleadged against Infant-baptisme Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark.* 16. 15, 16. Though I make no question but that they bely them at least some of them in other things, some upon report, as *Cluniacensis*, that *they denyed some of the Scripture*, it may be saith *Osiander, because they denyed the Apocryphal writings*, or perhaps *because they denied arguments valid from the rites of the old Testament*; some upon false inferences, which is a frequent thing in writers to make the consequences they gather from their writings the tenets of the Authors they impugne; some it may be out of that abuse of charging those tenets and practises upon all of the same profession, which is too true of some, as that all Christians did lewd practises, because the *Gnosticks* did so, that all Anabaptists are wicked because those of *Munster*, *Copp*, and some others proved so, in which way Mr. *B.* walkes page 138. &c. (for which the Lord forgive him) yet it seemes utterly unlikely to me, that in this *Petrus de Bruis and Henricus* and their followers should be belied, when so many of chief account in their time from several places charge them with denying infant-baptisme, and rebaptizing, *Petrus Cluniacensis* writes to 3. *Bishops of France, and Bernard* to the *Earle of St. Gyles* of purpose against them for this reason, *Bernard and Cluniacensis* put it for their prime error, *Petrus Cluniacensis and Eckbertus* produce, and take on them to answer their allegations against infant-baptisme, but not so (as I remember) any allegations against the Scriptures or Marriage, which

which they charge them to deny, and therefore it's likely they wrong them in these, not in that. As for the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, it might be true that some might be against Infant-baptisme, yet others not, some following *Peter de Bruis*, others *Waldus*; as it was in the reformation, when some followed *Luther*, others *Zwinglius* in the points of the Eucharist, Images, &c. or it may be that they all at the beginning held so, but after left it, which seemes to be the conceit of *Cassander ubi supra*. And yet in the old book wherein their doctrince is cited by *Illyricus* in his *Catolog. test. verit.* printed *Argentina* 1562. *pag.* 314. there are some speeches, which *Illyricus* is faine by glosses to free from the opinion of Antipædobaptisme: But whether the *Waldenses* were Antipædopatists or no what I did alleadge was rightly done, not with a *brazen face* or *seared conscience*, or *out of a desire to take up any slaunder* or *joine with any party to defend my cause*, as Mr. *B.* doth most unbrotherly insinuate, yea in my *Examen* part. 2. sect. 2. before I cite *Bernard* and *Cluniacenſis*, I have these words: *Now although he charge them with denying marriage & abstaining from meates, yet you may smell out of his own words that this was but a calumny*: but because by the reasons given I am induced to conceive notwithstanding Mr. *Ms.* and Mr. *Bs.* allegations that *Peter de Bruis* and *Henricus*, and other godly persons and Societies were 500. yeares ago Antipædobaptists; yea I conceive as good a catalogue of Antipædobaptists may be made almost in all ages as may be made for Protestants against many Popish corruptions, and better then Antiprelatists can make against Episcopacy. And this I dare still to do, and marvel Mr. *B.* dare bring such railing accusation, to which I onely returne, *The Lord rebuke him.* The other *untruth* if not *malice* Mr. *B.* chargeth me with, is concerning my dealing with himself, when I had in my *Valedictory Sermon* and *Antidote* shewed how impertinently the 2. monsters in *New England* were brought as evidences of Gods judgements against Anabaptists I added in my Sermon, one of the errors condemned in *New England* is the 21. [*To be justified by faith is to be justified by works*] which *I moved to be considered whether it were not neare Mr.* Bs. *doctrine Aphorisme* 73. of *Justific.* and in my *Antidote* sect. 8. page 24. said, *it is neare to it.* Hereupon Mr. *B.* adjudgeth *this dealing so grosse, as he never found in any Jesuite, a shamelesse charge*, and page 190. *the vile ebullition of rancor and malice in a most evident falshood, that hath left no roome for blushing.* And then cleares himself from the sense in which the Antinomists held it, and then addes. Now *what doth Mr. T. but bring this as the same text with mine? when it is even directly contrary.* To which I answer, Mr.

B.

B. page 189. in these words [*Your Language about the absoluteness of the Covenant is too like many of the vents of the Antinomists in N.E.*] useth the same dealing with me, which he chargeth me with towards himself. For he doth or might know when I say with many Divines the Covenant is absolute, I meane it as they do in respect of the first promise, *Heb.* 8.10. *I will write my Lawes in their hearts*, which Doctor *Twisse* and many other prove must be absolute or else *the grace of God must be given according to mans desert* as the *Pelagians* held, which thing I expresse plainly in my *Examen* page 164. whereas the Antinomians make it absolute in respect of justification, in which I am assured that Mr. *B.* knew by conferences with me that I was against them, and yet he chargeth me with symbolizing with them. But recrimination is no purgation. 2. It is not true that *I bring it in the same vaine with Mr. Bs. but neare it*: which is so true, that however their intent and his were contrary, yet their words are the same. For Mr. *B.* Aph. 76. and in the *first edition of the Saints everlasting rest* page 11. saith, *Doubtlesse the Gospel takes faith for obedience to all Gospel-precepts, of which the workes*, James 2.16. *of giving food or clothing to a brother are a part*: which if true, he that is justified by faith is justified by works, and so Mr. *Bs.* proposition is the same with the Antinominians, however he used it to a contrary end: it's the same *medium* though Mr. *B.* prove one conclusion by it, and the Antinomians another, and I think is condemned by the censure of them of *N. E.* in Mr. *Bs.* sense as well as the Antinomians. But Mr. *B.* goes about to clear himself from *error* in it and *singularly*, and then saith, *How can Mr. T. have groaned to think that no Minister in England is of my judgement* and then *challengeth me to confute the doctrine of his book, or leaves to judge whether I be not a meere empty calumniator.* And addes, that *these words of mine* [*I am sure in his letter to me, he saith he was hissed at from all parts of the Kingdome*] *are a relation like the rest from a bitter roote so most falsely, when I had his letters, which might have directed me to speak truth, that the words* [*from all parts of the Kingdome*] *are my addition, which is become ordinary with me.* Then mentions *the occasion of the passage in his letters, my offer of help to him for dividing ends, but he thought he had no need of my help, and was resolved not to engage with a writer of the Church.* To which I answer, 1. My exceptions against his doctrine in his *Aphorismes* have been sent to him afore his death, though not to answer his challenge, yet at the motion of his *Postscript*. I conceive he erres, 1. in making justifica-

tion

tion by faith to be onely in law title. 2. In making a first and after continued justification. 3. In making it a continued, not instantaneous act. 4. In making obedience to all Gospel-precepts an essentiall part of justifying faith, and not a fruite onely. 2. I did no where say that *I thought no Minister in* England *is of his judgement*, though I said *I thought he had not made one Minister of his judgement*. 3. to the crimination of my speaking falsely I will set down his own words in his letter to me, [*The pamphlet of justification I well knew was likely to blast my reputation with most Divines, and the issue hath answered my expectation: I am now so hissed at by them, that I feele temptation enough to schisme in my discontents*]. I had not his letter by me when I spake those words nor out of a bitter roote but to answer the prejudice against me as conceived singular. But there was no falshood in my speech [*by most Divines*] and [*from all parts of the Kingdome*] being equipollent. And if this be to adde falsely, our Lord Christ will be found to adde falsely *Mat.* 15.8,9. &c. my offer of helpe to him in what we agreed was not *for dividing ends*, but because of his complaint of weaknesse of body and want of time for study. It seemes he accounted me a *renter of the Church* afore my preaching at *Bewdley* the many Sermons on *Mat.* 28.19. against Infant-baptisme, for discovering of the error of it in my bookes without other practises. It appeares thereby that even then when he seemed to be most friendly he had hard thoughts of me, and however he protest of his love, yet his misinterpreting so many of the things I have done or said to him, and at last casting up his accusations in his book in charging me with frequent *untruths, schisme, pride, worse then the Devil in accusing my own children*, with bitter scoffes, and insulting tauntes, with other aggravations and expressions beyond brotherly and neighbourly respects, yea I may I think say, a sober minde are undeniable evidences of want of love to me, and candour towards me, if we may judge what is in a man by his deedes rather then by his words. As for his pretence of *zeale for God, the peace of the Church, and the duty of brotherly reproof*, were he never so much in the right, and I never so much in the wrong for my judgement, yet these could not justifie his carriage to me. And if other Ministers deale with me as Mr. *B.* Mr. *M.* Mr. *Baillee*, Mr. *Gerea* have done without doing me right after their false criminations of me, I shall have temptation to think that they have learned a principle like the Jesuites, to think it no sin to say as bad as may be against a supposed Anabaptist for the Pædobaptist cause.

Sect.

Sect. X.

That Mr. Bs. *charge of accusing and disputing my children out of the Covenant of Christ is vaine; and some inquiry is made how they are in the Covenant.*

I Have now gone through Mr. *Bs.* Epistles and History, vindicated my self and the truth from many objections. There are many other things which are scattered in his answer to my *Valedictory Oration* and *Corrective* of my *Antidote* which are somewhat besides the dispute it self, which I shall rather point at then insist on because many are scarce worth the taking notice of, but for the esteem Mr. *B.* and his book have gotten with men. Page 165. what he speaks of *my exceeding high and passionate disposition* was but his misdeeming likely upon misinformation, neither my words nor carriage shewed it. Page 166. what the *supposed girds* were is set down before out of his now printed book, whereby it seems my *few disciples* (as he miscalls them) are at least excused, and no notorious falshood chargeable on them: That which he saith, *I forced him to the disputation* I conceive is not right; how it came to passe is shewed above; that there were *thousands of people there* I think is overlasting: the tale of the dispute is made to prepossesse men with prejudice. I told him before that such a dispute was not fit to satisfy, and I gave him my reasons, and I propounded the way used at the Conference at the *Hague*, judged best by Dr. *Raynolds*: but the way Mr. *B.* took he liked best, and his carriage of it looks like an artifice cunningly contrived to please the common sort of Schollers and others of which few can discerne between sleight and solid proofs. But I doubt not my answer will prove Mr. *Bs.* arguments to be meer trifles. The *untruths* charged on me page 167. are upon his mistake of the words written before him. I said not [*to be used by Mr.* B.] but by others mentioned next before. That his passage was *like to be the beginning of a schism among those of* Bewdley was no jest, but a conjecture which the event hath proved true: how he misrepresents my words of *charging their blood on them, and hypocrisy to them* is before shewed: it's not true *I had been long time working a fearful schisme*, unlesse by accident, it being true which Mr. *Allen* and Mr. *Shepherd* say *Advertisement to the Reader*, pag. 27. *scarce truth or error can now adaies be received but in a way of schisme.* His lines were *likely to be the be-*

ginning of a ſchiſme, in that it was taken as if Anabaptiſts and with t'em my ſelf were adjudged hereticks by him: which if it were an untruth, yet it is ſo like a truth, that I think he that ſhall read in one period what Mr. *B.* ſayes of Hereticks, *that they end in wicked lives*, and in the next find the inſtance in Anabaptiſts, and after me named as one of them will conceive he called them and me hereticks. And however he proteſt he doth not, yet his aſſerting me a *Sect-Maſter* page 188. and his inclining to *Voſſius*, &c. their definition of an Heretick page 171. and his words page 259. make me think he comes not much ſhort of counting me an heretick. To his allegations of my ſpeeches concerning Mr. *M.* and Independents I have anſwered before. I may ſay the doctrine was one of the firſt hereſies, yet not cenſure the men that hold it as heretical; it's one thing to be formally an heretick, and another thing materially, to hold that which denominated a party heretical. In my *Examen* I tell Mr. *M.* and now Mr. *B.* that I think none of thoſe glorious lights mentioned held Mr. *M's.* poſition. I do not *judge all hereticks that be againſt my opinion*, but that they may be more juſtly ſtiled hereticques then my ſelf. Mr. *B's.* quickneſſe in replying afore he weighed my ſpeeches or perhaps my ſcantneſſe in expreſſions out of warineſſe what I ſaid to him (whom I found very captious) hath I perceive created me theſe hard cenſures. That which Mr. *B.* ſaies page 172. *he dare ſay of me* I dare ſay is falſe. The inference which he calls *ſtrange* is none of mine: the paſſage and time of writing it do ſtill prevaile with me to conceive that he wanted a ſpirit of love through ill ſurmiſes of me. Page 174. Infant-ſprinking or pouring water on them will not be proved baptiſme. I ſhall not *eaſe ſinners that own their infant-ſprinkling as baptiſm by my aſſertion*: that *I tell them they never ſinned againſt their baptiſme and engagement* is a fiction of Mr. *B.* in which he hath a pretty art. I ſaid not Mr. *B.* gave us a title to make us odious, but [*that might make us odious*] which imports the term might make us odious, not that Mr. *B.* had that purpoſe in using it. Page 175. He hath a diſcourſe *from the end of the accuſer and the oppoſition of juſtification to accuſation and condemnation* to prove, *That it is proper language to ſay he accuſeth another, who denies a ſuppoſed privilege to be due to him.* By the ſame reaſon the accuſers acculation may be ſaid to be condemnation, and execution too, for that is the end of the accuſer. I had thought [*accuſation*] noted the accuſers act, not his end: that juſtification is oppoſed to accuſation and condemnation ſhewes they are diſtinguiſhed, the one being the charging with a fault, the other paſſing ſentence. I muſt confeſſe I yet underſtand not his language of accuſing without

without charging with a fault, nor do I think any law-dictionary doth so define accusation. I do not think the non-visible churchmembership of infants is pœnal, or deprivation of a mercy now, it being only by the alteration of the Church-frame. Whether the not acknowledging infants visible churchmembership be a *denying a mercy reall* or imaginary, whether there be *injustice, scorne*, or any error in my tenet about it, is to be examined in answering his book. What I do hold I do it not *without naturall affection to my children*, out of conscience of maintaining truth. The very same he chargeth upon me for denying infant-baptisme might *mutatis mutandis* by the same reason be charged on him for denying infant-communion. I do judge this Rhetorical or Satyrical passage of Mr. *B.* to be a meer trifling in a serious matter. That which is said page 176. of *my disputing my children out of the Church by denying them to be visible Church-members* is Mr. *Bs* mistake in *defining visible Church-membership* as I shall shew in examining the 27. chap. of the first part of his book. It's not true I deny all *infants to be in Covenant with the Lord their God, or that title to salvation which upon promise they have in point of law.* Mr. *Bs.* conditional Covenant gives no title till the condition be put, which he will not say is true of any infants but the elect, who alone are children of the promise in the Apostles language, *Rom.* 9. 8. pag. 177. he saith, *I do all I can to keep infants out of the visible Church*, but I deny that to hinder their baptisme is to keep them out of the visible Church, or that to baptize them is to bring them in. If it be, why have they not the communion according to that which we reade, 1 *Cor.* 12. 13? Are Janizaries who were baptized children of Greek Christians therefore visible members of the Christian Church? Mr. *B.* though he had the Copy of my Sermon, yet misrepresents my words. I said not, *that it is the Devils part to say that the infants of believers are members of the visible Church*, but my words were [*it being an error, and such pernicious effects following, that people think therefore they are Christians because baptized*, (which opinion of theirs is confirmed by Mr. *Bs.* words. *For they are visible Christians that are baptized into the name of Christ, if they have not since by word or works renounced him*) *and rest therein, and are thereby held in carnall presumption, we ought rather to think those that maintain infant-baptisme play the Devils part*] which expressions of mine being added, the vanity of Mr. *Bs.* arguings will appear. That which he hath page 178. [*that it is no more thankes to me then to Satan, that I keep not God from making promise to his people*] which intimates I would do it if it were in my power (for if there be no more thanks to me then Satan, it is because

there's no more hindrance in me from doing it then in Satan, and so the same will) is a suggestion that exceedes all moderation, as if Mr. *B.* were bent not onely to rake up all the dirt he can to cast in my face, but also to put an ill construction on all I say. My answer was a faire answer to a virulent charge. In 2. senses I conceived it might be said that *Infants are disputed out of the Covenant of Christ*: the one as if my dispute made Christ not Covenant to them, the other as if it made them not Covenant to Christ. I said, neither was true. What saies Mr. *B.* ?1. *Election is not a Covenant.* Nor did I say it was. And then addes [*nor are they in Covenant because elected*] which speech is most false, contrary to *Rom.* 9. 8. where [*the children of the promise*] is all one with [*the Elect*] as the *Analysis* shewes, as may be seene in the Authors cited by me in my *Examen* part. 3. sect. 4. Besides whom more may be produced. I will add two now. Mr. *Rutherfurd* in that piece of his which is the exactest of his workes. *Exercit. Apol.* 2. c. 2. *num.* 7. *Soli electi dicuntur in Scripturis fœderati, filii & hæredes promissionis*, Rom. 9. 8. The elect alone are said in the Scriptures to be in Covenant, children, and heires of the promise, *Rom.* 9. 8. and Mr. *Norton in resp. ad Apollon.* c. 2. pag. 30. *Objectum fœderis gratiæ sunt soli electi.* The object of the Covenant of Grace are the elect alone. Next he saith, that I deny *that God Covenanteth with our infants to be their God in Christ, and to take them to be his peculiar people, which is the Covenant he formerly made with infants, and which he now affirmes.* What he affirmes distinctly I cannot well tell: he doth so confusedly expresse himself in his bookes. He distinguished between an absolute and a conditional Covenant of Grace. The absolute he saies belongs onely to the elect, but this he will not be thought to meane when he speakes of infants of believers being in Covenant, or baptism's sealing of it: yea he blames me often for so conceiving of him, and page 223. he disputes against that tenet as my fifth error. The conditional is a Covenant of justification and salvation upon condition of faith: this he saith is sealed by baptisme, not the other, and this he makes belonging to all the posterity of *Adam*, elect and reprobate. And this it seemes most likely he meanes, when he speaks of infants of believers being in Covenant, because it is that which baptisme seales, and they that are in Covenant are to be sealed thereby. But according to this conditional Covenant either all are in Covenant with God whether elect or reprobate, infants of believers or unbelievers, or else *none till they performe the condition*, which is faith, and so not all infants of believers. [Mr. *B. in his additions* to the *Saints everlasting rest*, part. 3. sect. 3 prop. 2. *A conditional promise puts nothing in being, till the per-*

performance of the condition; nor gives any certainty, but of such performance.] As for any Covenant of God or Christ besides these containing onely the promise of visible Church-membership, or such like imagined priviledges in the New Testament to infants of Gentile believers I take to be a phantasme, and when I come to examine Mr. *Bs.* opinion of infants visible Church-membership (which I could not do till I had his book) I doubt not to make it appear to be so, that not one text he hath brought proves such a promise, and that he hath not proved more to belong to infants by promise then I acknowledge, and yet neither visible Church-membership, nor right to baptisme in infancy ordinarily will follow thereon. As for that he saith in general termes, that I deny *that God covenanteth with infants of believers to be their God in Christ, and to take them to be his peculiar people*, is said like a Calumniator, my words being so plaine to the contrary in that very place. In a word, I have said that the Covenant or promise of regeneration, sanctification, forgivenesse of sins, adoption, and eternal life is not made to all the natural children of the most godly believers, no not of *Abraham* himself, or to any barely because they are their children, but because elect, or believers in their own persons; which Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Geree* in their answers to me confesse to be true, as being expressly delivered, *Rom.* 9. 8. and by the streame of Protestant writers maintained. But I deny not that many infants of believers are in the Covenant of Grace: nor dare I say that no infants of unbelievers are in the Covenant of Christ in this sense: I onely say I neither know which of the one or the other are thus in the Covenant of Grace. As for the arguings that he *that denies Infants baptisme doth deny them to be in the Covenant of Grace*, they are built on these fancies that to *be a seale of the Covenant of Grace is of the essence of baptisme, that there is a certain connexion between being in the Covenant of Grace and right to be baptized*: which with other *hypotheses* of Pædobaptists I shall examine in my *Review*. Mr. *B.* addes, That *I flatly deny infants Covenanting with God*, whereas my words were farre from such flat denial being onely these [*for my part I know not how any person should Covenant with Christ till he promise &c.*] which were not such a peremptory or flat denial as Mr. *B.* saies they are, and they are true, it being against all experience, that infants do so Covenant: but on the contrary when they are baptized cry and shew their unwillingnesse, as *August.* lib. 1. *de remiss. et mer.* pecc. c. 23. *flendo et vagiendo cùm in eis mysterium celebratur ipsis mysteriis vocibus obstrepunt.* Then Mr. *B.* saies, *I dissuade parents from so engaging their children in Covenant, and promising in their names, which*

yet

yet they ever did in the Church before Christ, and it was their duty to do, as Deut.29. and other places shew. But in which words I perswade parents not to do (as he saies I do) he doth not shew, my words are there all assertory of what I conceive infants cannot do in their own persons, not a word of perswasion or disswasion to the parents or any other. And for that which is added [*then it seemes you know not how a Father should engage his child by covenanting in his name*] and after [*you would have no parents to engage their children solemnly to God in Christ by Covenanting in their names*] there is not a word of it in that place. 'Tis true in my *Sermon* intituled *Fermentum Pharisæorum*, I gave a little touch against the use of sureties at baptisme according to the Doctrine of the catechisme in the common prayer-book, that they did *promise that they should believe*, &c. which I conceived onely belongs to Christ as *surety of the better Covenant, Heb.7.22.* But I never denied, that the Elders of a Nation may engage solemnly the posterity even the unborne to take the Lord for their God (but this I rather take to be an adjuration under a curse if they do not, then a promise for them that they shall) nor that a parent may engage his child by a promise of his own endeavour that he shall; and that the child is engaged thereby. but not by vertue of the Fathers promise, but by vertue of the obligation of the thing promised, the Fathers promise is an incitement to do it the rather, but makes not the child bound to do it of it self, but onely because the thing is a duty, which he were bound to did the Father promise for him or not. But I deny, that this makes a visible Church-member, or that in nature or law as his childs act according to the Gospel for his being admitted a visible Church-member. Now Mr. *B.* hastily answering me jumbles things together, and as one impatient of considering what I say, chargeth me with what I avow not, and then concludes scoffically, *And I pray you how well do you free your self from this charge?* Should I imitate him I should cry *shamelesse foul dealing*, &c. But I am resolved to examine his writing, not to follow his fashion Pag. 179. He saies, *I did not distinguish of disciples, or yield infants disciples in any sense.* & *If I acknowledge them disciples in any sense, I should speak out.* To which I say, I put in those words in my Sermon *in that sense, Christ appointed disciples to be baptized*, to intimate that I did not deny, but infants might be disciples by the immediate secret work of Gods spirit, though not in the ordinary & mediate way of preaching the Gospel, about which the rule *Mat.28.19.* is set. As for Mr. *B.* sense of a *disciple of Christ without learning Christs doctrine, of a servant of God without service actively or passively, a disci-*

ple

ple remotely by the Fathers being a disciple it is nothing like the use of the word [disciple] in the New Testament or the terme [*servant of God*] as equipollent to [*a disciple*] and no marvel I should mistake Mr. *B.* who used termes in a sense I never met with in the New Testament, and I still conceive to be a piece of new gibberish. And when he saith, *he took servant, and disciple according to their relative formal nature, and not either with the accidental consideration of active or passive*, it is no marvel I should be at a stand what to answer him using termes in such an uncouth non-sense acception as I never met with before. (*For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to battel?*) And it seemes to me a grosser absurdity which Mr. *B.* hath in those words, then any of those he chargeth me with, to take disciple and servant in their relative formal nature without learning or service active or passive; whereas Mr. *B.* himselfe page 92. where he saies, *the relation of a servant, disciple, souldier, husbandman, tradesman remaines when the act ceaseth for a time*, yet expressely saith, *the relation and so the denomination is from the act of service, learning &c.* and yet he would have infants to be denominated disciples and servants of God without their act of learning or service, or capacity of actual learning or service in an ordinary way: and he is not ashamed to call learning or service actively or passively *accidental to the title or denomination of a disciple or servant*. Which is a monstrous absurdity to make a denomination without the forme denominating, yea to count it accidental to conceive a relation without the foundation, which is all one as to call one a Father without begetting, a Lord without dominion, a signe without signification, not unlike the riddle *vir non vir, percussit non percussit, avem non avem, lapide non lapide, super arbore non arbore*, or rather *absurdorum absurdissimũ oppositum in apposito*. And yet this notion of a disciple never proved is the ground work of Mr. *Bs.* first argument, and therefore if I may use Mr. *Bs.* words, *they are very tractable soules that are led by his notions*. page 180. He thinks *strange that a man of my parts should know of no separation to God but by election or calling, he questions whether election be proper separation*, he saies *that the Jewes first-borne were seperated by a law, and men now by dedication separate goods to God, that he meanes separation neither by election nor extraordinary or ordinary call, but by the law or Covenant of God*. To which I reply, Mr. *B.* still abuseth me by leaving out my words [*as the case now stands*] which were put in as remarkable, to exclude that way of separation to God, whereby the first born, Priests, goods, &c. were holy as separated to God. Election is always with seperation, that is, differencing one from

ano-

another, and as election is said to be *according to purpose*, Rom. 9.11. so likewise separation, *Paul* was separated *from his mothers wombe*, Gal. 1.15. according to Gods pleasure and purpose, that is by his election: And with this separation infants may be said to be sanctified, as *Jeremiah* ch. 1.5. And so the terme [*holy*] is applied, *Rom.* 11.16. to the Jewes then unborne, who were after to be called ver. 24,25, 26,27. And *called Saints* is used 1 *Cor.* 1.2. As for infants of believers whether elect or reprobate outward federal holinesse I know no such, there's no law or Covenant separates every child of a believer to God. According to Mr. *B. the Covenant sealed by baptisme is conditional*, and that belongs to all the sons of *Adam* till persons are severed by believing, and unbeliefe: this Covenant therefore of it self without putting the condition doth not separate any to God, and so not infants till they be believers: the absolute is onely to the elect, and according to it, and so onely the elect are separated, which are not all, perhaps but a few of the children of believers, but an *Isaac* of all *Abrahams* children, *Rom.* 9.6,7,8. A law or Covenant of God separating all infants of believers barely for their parents faith to be visible members of the Christian Church is Mr. *Bs.* dream, as I shall shew with Gods assistance in examing his second argument.

SECT. XI.

About Mr. Bs. 4 *texts urged impertinently to prove infants visible Church-membership.*

PAge 183. he saies it is *a palpable untruth which I say, he four texts in his Epistle* Levit. 25.41,42. *Deut.* 29.11,12. *Act.* 15.10. 1 *Cor.* 7.14. *with Rom.* 11.19. *were all he concluded any thing from*, meaning *in the dispute at* Bewdley, and saies *the hearers know it and is to be seen before.* But to my best remembrance with search into the notes I took after, and the notes which were communicated to me it is no untruth. *Mat.* 28.19. I think he alluded to, but I remember not it was urged or any other text besides the forenamed as a *medium* from which to conclude any proposition to be proved. Then he saies, *I have been fully answered before, but yet addes concerning* Levit. 25. 41,42. 1. *The Jewes infants were infants, and the dispute between us was of the species.* Answ. 1. Though Mr. *B.* and before him Mr. *Cobbet* usually call the sort or ranke

of

of men that are infants the *species*; yet other Logicians usually call [man] the lowest *species* or kind, and say, *age and sex make not another kinde*. 2. But allowing Mr. *B.* and Mr. *Cobber* their language, I say, *the dispute is not about the* species *or kind, to wit, infants as infants*, but infants of believers, who are particular persons, and the question as it was rightly stated between me and Mr. *M.* was, *Whether the infants of believers were to be baptized with Christs baptisme by a lawfull Minister according to ordinary rule without extraordinary revelation or direction?* And if Paedobaptists will maintain their practise, they should make good this proposition, *That all the infant-children of professed or inchurched believers are to be baptized with Christs baptisme by the lawfull Minister according to ordinary rule.* Though Mr. *Baillee* and Mr. *B.* for some advantage set down this as their proposition to be proved, That *some infants are to be baptized.* M. *B.* saies *he had proved our priviledges greater then the Jewes, and that I deny it not, and that this* (to wit, to be Gods servants) *was not peculiar to them.* Whereas I had proved the contrary from ver. 55. and the whole chapter is about lawes peculiar to the Jews, and ver. 38, 39, 40. going before, shew plainly that this law was peculiar to the Jewes, that they and their children should return from servitude under which they were for poverty, at the year of Jubilee, and ver. 45, 46. plainly restraines it to the children of Israel, allowing them to take the children of strangers sojourning among them, and therefore proselytes, as an inheritance. And therefore in whatever sense it is meant that they are Gods servants, it is meant onely of *Hebrews*, as *Exod.* 21. 2. is expressed. I do not conceive, nor any interpreters that I meete with do expound this of a proselyte, but onely of an *Hebrew* borne. If *Cornelius* had children they had not been Gods servants in the sense there meant: which is clearly this, that they were his servants in this respect only in that place, in that they were to be disposed of not as men would, but as he onely would, who had right to them by his purchase in bringing them out of Egypt, and therefore *none can get soveraigne Dominion over them* (no not by their voluntary selling themselves) to *prejudice his*, as *Deodat. annot.* in *Levit.* 25. 42. Whence I infer, that it is a most grosse abuse of this Scripture in Mr. *B.* to urge it to prove that the infants of Gentile believers now are servants to God, related to him as a peculiar people, separated to himself from the world: which is spoken meerly in respect of the *Hebrew* children, and their corporal servitude, which was to be at Gods disposing by reason of his redemption of them out of Egypt. When he tells me *of my accustomednesse to mistakes*, it is more true of himself (as I have often shewed) yea

though the words were written before him. And in this very thing he calls *my mistake* that he *argued thus, whosoever is called Gods servant may be baptized*, whereas he might have seene if he had taken any care to set down my words rightly, that my words were as his own notary took them, and he hath printed them [*If this be a good argument Infants are called servants of God, therefore they are disciples, and must be baptized*] which was his argument either in words or substance. As for the conclusion and argument as he sets it down page 182. I think it was not urged in the dispute, and I have proved that *Levit.* 25.42. is meant onely of *Hebrew* children, not of Gentiles, nor in the sense Mr. *B.* would prove that they are relatively separate to God from the world in the sense as [Gods servants] is equipollent to a disciple of Christ. Page 184. he calls my answers to his allegation of *Deut.* 19.11, 12 *vain, senselesse cavils*, and then breaks out into words of pitty *to people that take their opinion on my word*. To which is I say, that my answers are not *vain, senselesse cavil*, will appear in my reply to Mr. *B.* about that text. And as he pitties *them that take their opinion on my word*, so I pitty them that take their opinion on his word, or any meer mans word contrary to Christs priviledge, *Mat.* 23.1. Page 184. in my words [adoption] is printed for [doctrine] Page 185. he repeates his frivolous charge of *our accusing our children as no disciples of Christ, and therefore no Christians, and therefore no ground to believe or hope they are saved*: thus calumniating me, when I have often said they may be both Disciples and Christians invisibly, and so have salvation; and we have great reason to hope they are in Gods election, by reason of the general indefinite promises of the Scripture and Gods usual dealing with his people, though there is no certainty either from Mr. *B.* grounds or mine, sith Mr. *B.* will not say that every visible Church-member is saved. All the difference between us is about their visible Church-membership, whether the denying that takes away ground of hope of their salvation: Mr. *B.* saith it doth, *because there's no hope of that persons salvation that doth not seeme to be of the invisible Church; but he that is not of the visible Church doth not seeme to be of the invisible. Ergo*; But the Minor is not true, as he takes the word [*seem*] and by Gods assistance I doubt not to shew, when I examine ch. 27. of part. 1. his mistake concerning the terme [*visible*] as if it were as much as to appear such in the *judgement of probability* though not descernad by sense, by which definition the opposite termes [visible and invisible] may be confounded, and the terme [visible] is used contrary to the common use of writers, whereby he misleades himself and others. Then he addes, But Mr. *T.* will say, *I be-*

believe that it is better that infants are no Christians, then that they were. But believe him that list for me. To which I say, I will not do as he often deales with me, charging me as *playing the Devils part, and worse*, but this I say, I know not what to conceive of these words, but that either by Gods judicial act of leaving him to himself, out of addictednesse to calumniate, or extream ill opinion of me, or which I much feare notwithstanding all his protestations out of disdainfulnesse of his Antagonist and delight in Satyrical quips he vented this passage. He cannot shew where ever I used such an impious speech: all I have said is onely this, It is a mercy that our children are not visible Church-members as the Jews were, because it brought a heavy bondage, and the Christian Church-constitution of voluntiers is better, nor do our children lose any thing by defect of such visible Church-membership. Yet if I had said so, that I would say so for the time to come who can say but God? Might I not have repented and altered my speech? Then he goes on to answer my arguing against his allegation of *Act.* 15.10. to prove infants disciples, and calls it *silly grounds, insipid arguing*, according to his usual Rhetorick, whereas the sillinesse (if any) is in his own inconsiderateneste of the strength of it. That text serves not Mr. *Bs.* turne unlesse it could be proved, that the very act or action which these false teachers did were the cutting with a knife the little skin of the privy member, for no more was done to infants in actual circumcision, nor were they passive subjects of any other action. Now Mr. *Bs.* argument is from what was done to infants by false teachers that infants are meant by [*disciples*, *Act.* 15. 10.] But it is manifest that the false teachers did not cut off that little skin, but the parents of the infants as Mr. *Bs.* text shewes, *Act.* 21.21. and the same text ascribing the contrary to *Paul* to that which the false teachers did, shewes it was teaching that was their putting on the yoke: which is more apparent from *Act.* 15.1. where what is said v. 10. *they put the yoke on the necks of the disciples*, is ver. 1. *they taught the brethren*: the disciples then are the brethren, and the putting on the yoke is the teaching them. My argument is this, that the false teachers did no other thing but teach, now the act there is ascribed to the false teachers onely, not to the parents of infants, none are blamed but they, they are spoken of and to, not the parents; therefore the putting on of the yoke was not actual circumcision, which was the parents act, not the false teachers: they neither did it, nor by any instrument attempt to do it themselves, though the one might follow on the other. And I dare still appeale to any that are of common understanding, whether that which the false teachers, did *Act.* 15.10. were to

infants or parents. And for Mr. *Bs.* exceptions, To the first, Mr. *B.* mistakes my confession, I confessed they did not put the yoke eternally, but onely endeavoured it, because though they taught them the necessity of circumcision, yet their doctrine was not received, but I never said to my remembrance, that the phrase of putting on the yoke noted barely their intent or attempt, but the act they did though *sine effectu* on the disciples. my words are plaine as they are printed, in which it is manifest the putting on of the yoke was by the teaching of the false teachers. As for Mr. *Bs.* instances they serve better for me then himself. He that teacheth people to be subject to the *Turk*, though thereby he inslave their infants by consequent, yet the subject recipient of his act are onely the people taught, nor doth any man in that speech understand the infants; and so it must be said of *Moses* subjecting the children of Israel to his law, though by consequent infants were circumcised, yet in this speech *Moses* subjected (by teaching or commanding) the children of Israel to his law. The terme [children of Israel] notes onely, or as Logicians speake *supponitly* parents onely. The act of Gods calling Christ out of Egypt is a complex act, noting the sending the Angel, the command to *Joseph*, his carrying Christ, whereof Christ was the object or *terminus*, not onely of the command. But the false Teachers Act. 15.10. was formally the single act of teaching not circumcision, they neither acted it nor attempted it in their own persons, and therefore could have no other subject recipient, but those that were taught, not infants. Page 187. He calls my speech [*that I think Mr. B. cannot shew in any one place where the word* [*holy*] *is taken in his sense for a state or person*] (I do conceive I said for the state of a person) *separated to God in that way he would have a person separated to God neither by election nor outward calling, nor in* [*any*] *other way that I know of in which holinesse is used for a state separated to God*] a new crotchet of the nature of the rest, and answers it with a quavers, and a jest. His quaver is, *Is it not enough that I prove it always taken for a separation to God, but I must shew that the word signifies a separation by this or that way or meanes effected?* His jest follows, *A man was out of love with his wife, &c. and is not this the same kind of reasoning with you?* To which I reply, It is not enough. For 1. Mr. *B.* sayes, that *holinesse is always taken for a separation to God.* 2. I am sure that it is taken for chastity, 1 *Thess.* 4. 3,4. and Mr. *B.* denies it not page 255. onely saies it is a part of sanctity, though ver. 3. *Bez.* a translates it, *id est, ut abstineatis à fornicatione*, which shewes the holinesse there is no other then chastity, or at least chastity in the first place, which is plain from ver. 4. where it is, *to possesse the vessel*, that is, the body

body in *holineſſe*, that is, chaſtity, which the oppoſition *to the luſt of concupiſcence*, ver. 5. and *uncleanneſſe*, ver. 7. do ſhew. And this acknowledged by *Illyricus in his clavis Script.* on the word *Sanctus*, *Piſcator in his ſcholie* on 1 *Theſſ.* 4. 4. and others which I ſhall produce in my *Review*, 3. Then it muſt needs follow according to Mr. *Bs.* poſition, that to be chaſte is to be holy in a ſtate of ſeparation to God. But I ſuppoſe Mr. *B.* will not ſay every chaſte perſon is in a ſtate ſeparated to God which may intitle him to baptiſme, therefore it is not enough for Mr. *Bs.* purpoſe to prove a perſon any way holy or in a ſtate ſeparated to God, that thereby he be intitled to baptiſme: but he muſt ſhew the way how he is holy, and that this intitles to baptiſme. The Jewes hereafter to be called are *holy*, *Rom.* 11. 16. by election. Mr. *Cobbet Juſt vindic.* chap. 3 ſect. 1. page 37. *The Jewes yet to come were in* Pauls *time holy federally*, Rom. 11. 15, 16. *not actually, but intentionally*, yet not then baptizable: the *Mede*, *Jai.* 13. 3. are called *Gods ſanctified ones*, yet not to be admitted viſible Church-members. I further add, that in his general ſenſe [*Legitimate*] might alſo ſignifie a ſtate ſeparate to God, as being that onely poſterity he allowes of according to his inſtitution of marriage, *Mal.* 2. 15. which is very frequently called *holy* by Divines. And therefore letting paſſe his jocular tale, my exception or anſwer to his reaſoning from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. deſerves a better refutation then he hath yet given. Then he makes me ſay, that no Scripture ſpeakes of holineſſe in his ſenſe, whereas my words (as above) were more wary, Mr. *B. I think cannot ſhew, &c.* And then tells me, that the *Jewes infants are called the Holy ſeed, and that by covenant or law, which is his ſenſe, and then chargeth me with laying by conſcience and common modeſty, having little tenderneſſe of conſcience in accuſing his will in charging him with a groſſe falſhood, that he was willing to carry things in generals, and not to tell diſtinctly how infants are holy and in a ſtate ſeparated to God, whereas he told me he meant holy by law or Covenant.* Notwithſtanding which I may yet conceive him willing to carry things in generals, ſith this very explication is in generals, the law or Covenant, as he calls it, being not diſtinctly named and ſhewed where it is, and upon what conditions that ſtate of ſeparation to God which infants have is aſcertained, whether upon their own act or parents, and if upon parents whether immediate or mediate, whether to the truth and reality or profeſſion, nor wherein that ſtate of ſeparation to God conſiſts, or what is the benefit of it: all or of ſome which perhaps I apprehend Mr. *B.* rightly in now, yet not till I had read over his book again and again, and pickt out his meaning by comparing many paſſages together: which becauſe

he

he did not then, nor since in his printed writings put together as others do in their *theses* they maintaine. I guessed he was willing to carry things in the general, and if I did say so (which Mr. *B.* and I must take on his Scribes word) in my Sermon without any caution, Mr. *B.* might have imagined that I meant it with this caution (which is ordinarily allowed in constructions of such speeches, where the matter leades us to conceive them intended) that I conceived him unwilling: which might be the more allowed to me in that speech which I had not a word written when I spake it; which of all other Mr. *B.* is least fit to except against me for, having in print offended in this way in worse manner, page 185. But to the matter now we conceive his meaning, I still say the same, that I think he cannot shew one place, where [holy] is taken for separated to God in his sense. He alleadgeth that the *Jewes infants are called the holy seed:* though he name not the text, (which had been fit) yet I guesse by his words page 83. he meanes *Ezra* 9.2. in which place onely and *Isaiah* 6.13. I find this terme in Scripture. But *Ezra* 9. 2. doth not speak of infants, but such *a holy seed as mingled themselves with the people of the land*, which was in marriage, which will not be said of infants; nor is [*holy seed*] there meant of a state separated to God in Mr. *Bs.* sense by Covenant promising it to believers, that their infants should be visible Church-members: For this holinesse was a state of difference or separation onely by legal descent from Israel, not by the faith of next parents, and it did intitle them to a peculiar priviledge of being reckoned in the genealogy of Israel, or in full communion with the Common-wealth of Israel in respect of inheritance, marriage, &c. though they fell to Idolatry, as *Jeroboam*, *Ahaz*, *Manasseh*, &c. did. But proselytes though believers were not *the holy seed* there meant, they were not forbidden to marry the daughters of the people of the land. Yea the children of the holy seed begotten upon prohibited women, as the daughters of the Nations there mentioned, were with their mothers to be put away as unholy according to the law, *Ezra* 10. 3. contrary to the resolution of the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 7 12, 13, 14. which evidently shewes that the Jewes are called *the holy seed* by their descent according to the law of *Moses*, and that the term [*holy seed*, *Ezra* 10.2.] is all one with [*Legitimate*] and if the Apostle did allude to that place in *Ezra* it serves more for my sense then Mr. *Bs.* and the sense may be conceived this, *If the unbelieving husband were not as sanctified to his wife so as that they might lawfully live together, then the children should be unclean, that is illegitimate, as those in* Ezra: *but now, that is it being determined that the law of* Moses *concerning prohibiting marriage with some people is voided, and unequal*

marriage

marriage is not dissolved, your children are holy that is legitimate. His evasion page 188. about a judgement of charity will be found insufficient to avoid my exception against his exposition, which is mistaken by him; nor will it at all smite me, my exception being not as he imagines, that upon a judgement of charity concerning the sincerity of a persons profession he is not to be taken for a real believer: But that Mr. *B.* determining *that the unbeliever is sanctified onely, to the believer, who is not onely such according to the judgement of charity, but also really such before God; and the Apostles consequence including this Proposition according to his exposition, that the children of such only are holy, that is, after* Mr. B. *visible Church-members and baptizable, of necessity all other by his exposition are prohibited to be baptized; and therefore of necessity he must follow the rule according to Mr. B. exposition must know the reality of the parents faith, which being impossible to be known without special revelation he may baptize none without it.* Now Mr. *B.* answers not at all to the main thing, how by his exposition a man can go upon certainty that he doth his duty: but how without respect to his exposition a man may take a person for a sincere believer, and so baptize him. But this serves not his turne in this case. For it is the duty of the baptizer to baptize onely visible Church-members: this Mr. *B.* will not deny: now of infants who can make no profession, their visible Church-membership is known onely by their parents believing; but according to Mr. *B.* exposition of the Apostle, those infants onely are visible Church-members whose parents are real believers before God: no hypocrites if Mr. *B.* rightly expound the Apostle can make his infant a visible Church-member, and baptizable, for his children are unclean. But it is not possible for a baptizer to know the parent to be a real believer before God without special revelation, and therefore without it he cannot be certain he doth his duty according to Mr. *B.* supposition; yea he may be certain he doth not his duty: For he may be certain he cannot observe the rule of baptizing onely the infants of those that are real believers before God, it being certain some in the visible Church are hypocrites, and he is not to baptize the infants of such, if Mr. *B.* rightly expound the Apostle, they being unclean, that is, no visible Church-members, not baptizable, and therefore he may be certain in baptizing promiscuously infants of visible professors that he doth not his duty, if Mr. *B.* exposition be good, but sins against the Apostles determination, in baptizing those that are not baptizable by the Apostles determination as Mr. *B.* expounds him, and if he be intelligent against his own light: but cannot be certain he doth his duty, because he cannot know which are baptizable, those infants being

ing onely baptizable according to the Apostles resolution as expounded by Mr. *B.* who are the children of believers not onely so accounted in the judgement of charity, but also really such before God, which he cannot know without special revelation.

SECT. XII.

That Mr. B. unjustly chargeth me to be a Sect-Master.

TO his virulent and most unrighteous speech of me *page* 188. *that he hath as good evidence that I am a Sect-Master, as that I am a Christian*; I have replied before *sect.* 4. And now I say further, that my conscience acquits me from the guilt of making any *Sect*; and my proceedings at first with my brethren in the Ministery manifested in my *Examen* and *Apology*, in my applying my self to the *Assembly* and Mr. *M.* do fully clear my aime, to have been *Reformation* with peace and concurrence in the work of Christ with them: (which course Mr. *B.* approves *pag.* 246.) and if my writings had been fairely examined, it is very probable they had not bin printed. What I did, I was necessitated to, by their sleighting the thing, and determining contrary to my positions, in a *Magisterial* manner, notwithstanding my writings; whereby it became penal to hold my *tenet*; which enforced me to print. And yet neither then did I meddle with the practise till Mr. *Baillee* awakened me, by telling me, *my infant-baptisme must be null, by my principles.* Nor have I baptized (save one nearely related to me,) but where I was chosen a preacher; where I conceived my self bound to baptize (by Christs rule, *Mat.* 28. 19.) those disciples to whom I preached: nor did I joine any in communion, till I saw that those that did their duty in being baptized, were rejected and made odious, with Ministers and people, whereby they are necessitated to join in communion by themselves. And if any others do not joine with them, it is partly because notwithstanding I am for my own particular much inclined to unite in the communion, those that differ in judgement about *infant-baptisme*, according to my judgement expressed in my *Apology* sect. 12. and Mr. *Jessey's* determinations in his book intitled *A Store-house of provision to further resolution in sundry cases of conscience*; yet because it is manifest from *Acts* 2. 41, 46. 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3. & 12. 13. persons were *baptized* afore they *brake bread* together, and *Justin. Martyr. Apolog.*

polog. 2. *ad Antoninum* hath *theſe* words, ἡ τροφὴ αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῖν εὐχαριστία, ἧς οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ μεταλαβεῖν ἐξὸν ἔστιν ἢ τῷ πιστεύοντι ἀληθῆ εἶναι τὰ διδασκόμενα ὑφ' ἡμῖν, καὶ λουσαμένῳ τὸ ὑπὲρ ἀφέσεως ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀναγέννησιν λουτρὸν, καὶ οὕτως βιοῦντι ὡς ὁ Χριστὸς παρέδωκεν, that is, *This food is with us called the Euchariſt or thanksgiving: of which it is not allowed for any other to partake, but him that believeth thoſe things to be true which are taught by us, and is waſhed with that waſhing which is for the forgiveneſſe of ſins and unto new birth, and that lives ſo as Chriſt hath delivered*, which paſſage is alleadged by Mr. *B.* page 156. though maimedly. And *Auguſtin. tom.* 7. *de pecc. mer. et remiſſ.* lib. 1. cap. 20. *Ad ſacramentum menſæ Domini nemo ritè niſi baptizatus accedit.* And *Lumb. ſent.* l. 4. diſt. 8. *Hoc cœleſte manna non niſi renatis præſtari debet.* And the generality of Popiſh and Proteſtant Divines hold ſo. Mr. *B.* page 342. *We have no warrant by word or example in all the New Teſtament, to admit any member into the Church, without baptiſme*; and therefore the taking any without baptiſme to the Lords Supper, will but ſtrengthen men in their opinion, that their infant-ſprinkling is ſufficient; and partly, becauſe by Mr. *B.*s book and other meanes men are ſo poſſeſſed with the reſtoring of baptiſme, as if it were an error, ſchiſme, a practiſe accurſed by God, that conſciencious timorous men do of themſelves ſhunne us, and others furiouſly oppoſe us; therefore I ſee a neceſſity of deſiſting from that enterpriſe, yet reſolved to join with other Chriſtians of different judgement in what agreement & communion I can with a good conſcience in prayer, preaching, diſciplin, &c. And I ſpeak unfeignedly notwithſtanding all the injuries done me by Mr. *M.* Mr. *Geree*, Mr. *Baillee*, and now beyond all the reſt by Mr. *B.* yet my heart is towards them to promote with them the work of Chriſt according to the ſolemn Covenant, & I think Mr. *B.* & others are not ignorant that I have as abſolutely and diligently oppoſed, if not ſo happily, the Popiſh, Arminian, Antinomian, Familiſtical, Socinian errors now broached as other men. What I ſaid in my *Apology* ſect. 20. I ſay ſtill, *I ſeek unity with truth*, and I am certain that Mr. *B.* hath moſt injuriouſly accuſed me as unpeaceable, whether it hath come from others ſuggeſtions or his own miſconceits of me. To that which is from pag. 189. to 169. is anſwered before.

SECT. XIII.

That it is not a right way to judge of the truth of a doctrine by strange accidents, though monderous.

PAge 197. He drives on *more furioso*, having recited my words concerning unsafeneſſe to judge of doctrine by ſuch accidental ſtrange things as Mrs. *Dyers* and *Hutchinſons* monſtrous birthes in *New England*, and alle adged an example of determining that God was againſt the marriage of Prieſts by the falling of a houſe, and added, we are to judge God may order accidents for ſtumbling blocks, he flies out thus, *Will not this man rather fight againſt heaven, and diſpute againſt miracles then let go his error?* and then in his pathetick Rhetorick inſinuates, *as if this ſpeech of mine were weakening the credit of Gods teſtimony in wonderous providences, not farre from the blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, that I am fallen ſo farre as freely to ſacrifice Gods glory to my fancies*, and then brings in exceptions againſt me in four things, 1. *That I call them onely ſtrange accidents.* 2. *Compare it to the falling of a houſe.* 3. *That I diſſwade from judging of doctrine by ſuch accidents.* 4. *Yea rather would have men think that they are ſtumbling blocks that men ſhould not receive the truth.* And then diſcourſeth that *the monſters in New England were the extraordinary directing finger of God*, and addes: *Would Mr. T. have us ſo carelеſſely regard Gods judgement &c. yea and rather judge the contrary? It ſeemes if he had ſeene the wonders of Egypt, he would not onely have been hardned as Pharaoh, but judged God laid them as ſtumbling blocks. Who would not tremble to hear the holy God to be accuſed by man, as if he led his people into evil by his wonders?* and then ſets down two propoſitions, 1. *That true miracles are never to be diſtruſted, but believed what ever they teach, that they are Gods teſtimony,* Joh. 14. 24. 2. *That ſome wonders that are not proper miracles in their nature, may yet have a plain diſcovery of the finger of God in the ordering of them, and ſo when they are not againſt Scripture but according to it, ſhould exceedingly confirm us, and ſuch he conceives thoſe monſtrous birthes were, and that the forgetting them among us is no ſmall aggravation of our ſin.*

To which paſſage I am neceſſitated to anſwer, being ſo deeply charged upon

upon such mistaken grounds, 1. That I hope the Lord hath ordered this *Shimei*-like looseneſſe of his pen to diſcover two things for his own good and the good of them that doate on him and his book, 1. His extreame bitterneſſe or uncharitableneſſe towards me and thoſe he termes Sectaries. 2. His hatty, inconſiderate, raſh and immoderate cenſures, miſconſtructions and determinations. For wherein do I fight againſt heaven, and diſpute againſt miracles rather then let go my error? In which words did I either weaken the credit of the teſtimony of God? or ſacrifice freely Gods glory to my fancies? or regard ſo careleſſely Gods judgement? or rather judge the contrary to Gods judgement? Whence may it ſeeme I would have been hardened as *Pharaoh*, and judged God laid his wonders as ſtumbling blocks? Or accuſed God as if he led his people into evil by his wonders? Let Mr. *B.* prove any of theſe without his childiſh exclamations and vaine Rhetorick, and I will confeſſe my ſelf worthy to be held an *Anathema*: if not let him be dealt with *lege Remiâ*, or rather *lege Divinâ*, *Deut.* 19.18,19. Were I minded to retort I might take up ſome of Mr. *B's.* Rhetorick, and apply it to the Author of the paſſage in the Epiſtle to the Church *at Kederminſter*, in which in all likelihood the thankſgiving daies for victories againſt the Scots are termed *offering a ſacrifice to Mars, and keeping holy-daies for killing the Saints.* In this manner, will not this man fight againſt heaven? weaken the teſtimony of God? ſacrifice freely Gods glory to his own fancies? regard careleſſely Gods judgement? judge the contrary to Gods judgement? &c. Who dare aſcribe thoſe glorious workes of providence in giving victories to a weake, and faire ſmaller Army brought into a great ſtreight, over an Army double the number, when ſolemne appeales to God were made on both ſides to ſhew whoſe cauſe he owned, to chance of warre and call the thankſgiving for that victory offering a ſacrifice to *Mars*, uſing though a Preacher of the Goſpel ſuch a Heatheniſh profane cenſure and language concerning the actions of praiſe to God enjoined by a Chriſtian State, and performed by holy Chriſtians, who had by prayer obtained ſuch a ſignal mercy? But I forbeare any more of this, and proceed to examine what Mr. *B.* ſaies, 1. That I call *them onely ſtrange things*. Anſw. If they be referred to [miracles wrought by God] which is in the next period, and in Grammer conſtruction ſhould be the accident, then it is falſe, that I call them onely ſtrange accidents, and not miracles: if to the monſtrous births in *New England*, I do call them onely ſtrange accidents in that place, being willing to uſe a general terme abſtracting from miracles and wonders, which are differenced by Mr. *B.* himſelf in his *Saints everlaſting reſt pa.* 2. *c.* 4. *ſ.* 1.

yet using a terme that signified they were from remarkable providence. Even Mr. *B.* himself I do not find to terme those accidents in *New England* miracles, but the *extraordinary directing finger of God, the evident hand of God, wonders of providence*, which I also freely acknowledge. 2. He saith *I compare it to the falling of the house, which might easily come from a naturall cause*. Answ. 1. He changeth [them] into [it] and so leaves it doubtful what he meanes that I compare with the falling of the house: But I imagine he meanes the monstrous births, because he addes that the *falling of the house might easily come from a natural cause*. But the truth is, I did not make any comparison between the one and the other accident as if the one were no more observable then the other, but onely gave an instance to prove, that it is not safe to determine of a doctrine whether pleasing God by an accident: sith that accident in appearance to them was as evident a providence of God as could be, that while they were debating the matter it should then fall on one side where married Priests were, and not on the other side, where were Monkes. And in respect of the time it was in shew a more likely evidence of Gods disproving marriage of Ministers, then the monsters in *New England* of disproving Mr. *Wheelwrights* doctrine, they not happening at the time of his preaching, or the *Assemblies* sitting at *Cambridge* in *New England*, *August* 30. 1637. or the Courts proceeding against them, *Oct.* 2. 1637. but at another time and place though near them, and not in so open a manner to publique view as that was, though after evidenced sufficiently at the taking up of Mrs. *Dyers* child. And though the fall of a roome might come from a natural cause, yet it falling at such a time on one part, and not on another, I believe if Mr. *B.* had been then present he would have been apt to take it as an extraordinary providence of God against married Priests, as Doctor *Gouge* in his printed Sermon, and many others did the fall of the house at *Blackfriers on Drury, Redyate* Popish Priests, &c. *Oct.* 26. 1623. against the Papists. 3. *That I dissuade from judging of doctrine by such accidents*. To which I answer, My words are plain, I conceive no safety of judging what doctrine is true or false, but by going to the law and testimony, and trying thereby, and therefore bid men take heed how they follow Mr. *B.* in his direction, and of so adhering to the voice of God in monsters or other providences as barely upon them to judge a doctrine to be false. And this I still think good advice, 1. Because the Scripture is the sufficient and onely rule which now we have to judge doctrines by whether they be true or false 2 *Tim.* 3. 16, 17. 2. It is the command of God, *Deut.* 13. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. notwithstanding the doing of a signe or wonder, yet to look to the doctrine of a prophet.

The-

The like is *Isai.9.20. Luke 16.29,31.* yea *John 5.39.* Christ referres them to the Scriptures notwithstanding his miracles. 3. Because though true miracles are never to be distrusted, yet Christ hath foretold us, *Mat. 24.24.* There shall arise false Christs and fals Prophets, and shall shew great signes and wonders, insomuch that (if it were possible) they shall deceive the very elect, and the like is foretold, *2 Thess. 2. 9,10. Revel. 13. 13, 14.* 4. Because true miracles themselves do not testifie immediately concerning the doctrine, but the person that he is sent of God, and consequently of his doctrine, *John 3.2.* and then they are wrought by the person himself. As for other providences or real wonders if not wrought by the person, but on him, though they should be dreaded and observed as Gods workes, and when we have examined the doctrine by Scripture they have great influence on us either to confirme or unsettle in an opinion, yet they are rather discoveries of Gods judgements of men and their practises, then their opinions; and yet therein we may mistake thinking Gods judgement may be against one when it is against another, and thinking them worse then others contrary to our Saviours doctrine, *Luke 13.1,2,3,4,5.* And in the relation of such accidents there is not alwayes that certainty that may settle a person as appeares by the mistakes of many, and many such are invented and related with much art and confidence so as to deceive credulous people frequently. In a word, I conceive Mr. *B.* himself saith in effect as much as I say, *I know wonders that are not miracles are not to be interpreted or trusted to contrary to the word, for Satan by Gods permission may perform them, and Antichrist may do lying wonders.* 4. He excepts against me that *I say, God would rather have us judge that they are stumbling blocks, that people should not receive the truth*, and most of his invectives are against this Answ. Nothing is so well said but may be depraved when a mans words are misinterpreted. My words are, We may think we ought to determine, that God may order accidents so, as to become stumbling blocks, that people should not receive the truth rather then by any accidents to determine a truth to be an untruth. Which are different from that which Mr. *B.* sets down as my words, 1. He recites my wordes thus [they are] as if they spake of the accidents next mentioned, whereas my words are [God may order accidents so] which note onely accidents possible. 2. Whereas my words were comparatively spoken to this purpose, that accidents are so far from being a rule to determine of truth, that God sometimes orders them to become stumbling blocks, which is the same with that of *Moses, Deut. 13.3. The Lord your God proveth by signes and wonders of the false Prophet, to know whether you will keep his coommandments.* Mr. *B.* recites them

them thus [*We are to judge they are* (meaning such accidents) *ſtumbling blocks that people ſhould not receive the truth*] as if I had ſpoken poſitively of thoſe particular accidents forementioned, that God did order them to that end, whereas I onely to give reaſon of my adviſe of warineſſe ſet down my obſervation comparatively, and ſpake of accidents that might be not of what were. Which being thus ſtated, Mr. *Bs.* exceptions are anſwered, and ſhew either his inconſiderateneſſe in what he ſaies, or pronenes to miſconſtrue what I ſpeak. That which he puts in by the way of his opinion concerning the ſin againſt the Holy Ghoſt, *as if it did lie much in an infidelity againſt the convincing teſtimony of miracles, and of the not believing true miracles, and of Gods ordering ſome wonders, and the accidents in* New England, may be allowed him, yet makes nothing to prove that remarkable providences of God are a ſafe rule by which to judge what doctrine is true, and which is falſe. As for his words of me [*that it ſeemes if I had ſeen the wonders of Egypt, I would not onely have been hardened as* Pharaoh, *but judged God laid them as ſtumbling blocks*] I leave others to judge what ſpirit they proceed from, and do reſolve that though he paint me as an incarnate Devil or worſe. I ſhall take him for a Saint though a very diſtemper'd one. Page 198. the Scribe hath written in my words [or none of them] in ſtead of [or to them onely.]

SECT. XIV.

That Mr. B. *doth not rightly expound Chriſts rule,* Mat. 7. 15, 16. *nor is the unholineſſe of men a note to know falſe doctrine by.*

PAge 199. He would vindicate his interpretation of *Mat.* 7.15. from my exception, and ſaith *Chriſt tells them how to diſcerne whole parties of falſe Prophets, and not how to deſcerne every particular man that is ſuch.* But this is onely his ſaying, and the contrary is proved by theſe reaſons, 1. Thoſe falſe Prophets Chriſt ſaies we ſhall know by their fruits, whom he bids us beware of: but they are not onely whole parties of them, but alſo every man that is ſuch, *Ergo.* The Major is plaine by the term [them] which referres to the falſe Prophets ver. 15. the Minor I think Mr. *B.* will not deny. 2. They are known by their fruits, which did come to them in ſheepes clothing, but inwardly were ravening wolves; for [them] ver. 16. relates to ſuch. But theſe are particular men as ſuch, and not onely whole parties; otherwiſe Chriſt ſhould not bid beware of one

falſe

false Prophet, nor censure such a one as a wolfe, but onely whole parties of them: which had been very imprudently done so to expose his disciples to be a prey to sir gle wolves, and onely warne them to take heed of a company of them together. Then he askes m', *But what real Heretick? can Mr.*T. *name that had holy lives*? It is hard to answer his question, because of the difficulty to determine who is a real Heretique, some onely making him an heretique that holds an error against the foundation, others any error against the doctrine of Christ, some make it necessary that it be held with pertinacy, some with a party, some against self-conviction. Mr. *Bs.* speeches shew he is not fully resolved. Nor is it easie to determine who erres, nor what degree of holinesse is necessary to a holy life, or how it may be known. But I told Mr. *B.* in my Antidote *Pelagius, Arminius* and some others have been reputed Heretiques, and to have been of holy, and so have many zealous Papists and others. But however (saith Mr. *B.*) *the best have made nothing to sacrifice the unity and peace of the Church to their fancy, and rent it in pieces to strengthen their party*: whence Mr. *B.* seems to infer they had not holy lives, but were wicked. I answer, if any man of purpose do so, I cannot think him to live holily; I know *the wisdome from above is peaceable*, Jam. 3. 17. Yet holy men thinking their fancy to be Gods truth, may out of zeal to their opinion rend the Church, and yet be holy men. Mr. *B.* saith in his *Epist. Dedic.* to the *Saints everlasting rest* direct. 5. *That independency which gives the people to governe by vote, is the same thing with separation, which comes from pride and ignorance, and directly leades to the dissolution of all Churches.* Then they that hold it hold their fancy, and rend the Church by it, and so by Mr. *Bs.* rule none of them were of holy lives. If Mr. *B.* censure so Mr. *Ainsworth*, Mr. *Robinson* stiled by *Rivet. Explic. Dec. Exod.* 20. præc. 4. *vir pius*, a godly man, &c. he will vent a more arrogant speech, then any he chargeth me with. Mr. *Bs.* opinions about faith and justification are by some counted fancies; if he should by them make a breach in the Church, yet I durst not deny his life to be holy. *He calls it my reproach, that I think it may be safely said, that there are proportionably as many unholy Pedobaptists as of the opposites*: to refute which he referres us to that said before, where I shall in its place examine it, and shew that he hath done much wrong to Antipædobaptists in two things, 1. In charging them with the evils of sundry who were never of their society. 2. In charging the evils of some few Apostates upon all the Churches, though they expressely rejected the persons, and declared even publiquely in print against their wicked principles and practises, yea have been the first and almost the onely

men.

men who have so declared, though many more then ever were of their Churches have fallen into the wicked Ranting wayes besides *Copp*, and some others termed Anabaptists. He tells me, *Lay aside the common people, and compare each party that are carried to it in judgement and in conscience, and experience will confute me, and then bids me shew who came to the height of* Cop, *or those in* Germany. To which I say, Who are carried to one side or other in judgement and conscience, it's impossible to determine, and therefore such an estimation as Mr. *B.* propounds is not feasible: it's known many have been wicked on both sides: *Copps* and his followers madnesse is disclaimed by the Churches in *London* under baptisme in their *Heart-bleedings for professors abominations*, and therefore by *Austins* rule should not be charged on the Churches. Whether *Hacket* or any other were as wicked, who knowes but God? The evil carriages of the men have risen from their opinion of high enjoyments of God in the spirit, when they left ordinances, as was observed in the *Levellers*, not while they kept to baptisme and Church-communion. Mr. *Weld* observed in his *Story of the Antinomians* page 40. *that conceit of special revelations was the original of Mrs.* Hutchinsons *miscarriage*, and the like is conceived of the Anabaptists in *Germany*, and the like tragedy was neare acting in *New England* as there. Mr. *B.* I still judge does ill to aggravate so farre the actions of those in *Germany* and some in *England*, as if no miscarriages of others were comparable. I am sure it is no rule to judge a doctrine false by this, that the professors miscarry, but only to make men wary and fearful. If it be, he must judge the same doctrine false by reason of some mens miscarriages, and true because of others godly living. Page 200. *he excepts against my Logick for saying it is not* idem per idem *to know a false Prophet by his false doctrine. For what is a false Prophet but one that preacheth false doctrine?* I answer, A false Prophet is one that is not sent by God, as a false Apostle, 2 *Cor.* 11. 13. is one that is not an Apostle of Christ, and it is no trifling repetition of the same, but the sure note that Christ gives, to say a false Prophet is known by his false doctrine. *Ball* Trial of grounds for separation chap. 13. page 312. If we look into the Scriptures of the old and New Testament, we shall never find the Prophets called true or false in respect of their outward calling, but in respect of their doctrine. When Mr. *B.* interprets [likely] by [ordinarily, or for the most part, or usually] as our ordinary sense of that phrase, I think he mistakes in the meaning and use of the word, and that [probably] doth better answer to it then [usually.] However, sith he dare not say that constantly all false doctrines end in wicked lives, Christs direc-

tion

tion as he makes it, *to know false Prophets by their wicked lives, which ordinarily though not constantly they end in however they begin otherwise*, is a very blind one for his people of *Kederminster* to make use of, sith they cannot by it discerne an Antinomian or Anabaptist to bea false Prophet to beware of them, till they have observed the end of a whole party proving wicked, which perhaps will not be till they are dead that are tempted by them.

Sect. XII.

Mr. Bs. insinuations of the wickednesse of Anabaptists is Calumniatory, and vainly alledged to condemne their doctrine of Antepedobaptisme: Anabaptists and with them my self are vindicated from charges of schisme, neglect of the Lords day, &c.

PAge 201. To deterre his hearers from Anabaptistry Mr. *B.* had said, *Where hath there been known a society of Anabaptists since the world first knew that proved not wicked?* A direct answer to this question this propounded can hardly be made, nor is it necessary. It can hardly be made, it being a question that depends partly upon much reading of histories in former times both about the doctrine and manners of men comparatively obscure and contemned. Whereas Historians speak little but of eminent societies, and occurrences that make a remarkable change in the affaires of their time: and of things done in those ages in which Historians are but few, and not of the best note, when greatest darknesse was on the Church, and hardest censures of the best partly upon an exact intelligence of the affaires of the present Churches of so called Anabaptists in many Countreys, who have been so depressed by the opposite party as that it is somewhat hard to learne where they be. All the intelligence I can get of them is by bookes for the most part of them that are their adversaries. Besides, it is very difficult to passe a censure upon a society, which is not a consistent but a flowing body, some members coming in, some cast out, some dying, some sound, some rotten, some removing dwellings, subject to change of Ministers, opinions, &c. whether in the end they have proved wicked or not, it being usual that some in such societies do prove wicked, and others prove well. And what man is there that wants not either age to see the beginning and end of such a society, or opportu-

nity to know the state of all or most of such a society, or judiciousnesse to conclude whether they proved wicked or not, it being certain that men may fall foully and yet die in Christ, and there being no fixed rule for us to judge who dies wicked, who not. The wisest Divines do advise caution in judging the final estate even of selfe-murtherers that have died with horrible speeches in their mouthes not long before their death. I thinke God onely fit to judge of mens final estate, and therefore think him fit onely to resolve Mr. *Os.* question. If I should aske Mr. *B.* where hath there been known a society of Antiprelatists, that have not in the end proved wicked, I think it would be as hard a thing for Mr. *B.* to give answer to it, as for me to give answer to his question. When men speak of men they speak as they are affected, some magnifying whom, others debase, some counting that wicked which others count pious, he's canonized as a Saint, a Martyr by some who is judged a Traitor, Malefactor by others. They that passe such a censure must trust much to informations, which whether they be partial or impartial, true or false who can tell? Nor is it necessary to answer Mr. *Bs.* question. For to what end? Is it thereby to conclude against me the doctrine they held? But what may be known by the certain rule of Scripture without this uncertain sign. And therefore I conceive of this question not unlike the artifice of the Jesuites to deterre people from the plain doctrine the Protestants hold by calling for Catalogues of Protestants in all ages, demanding where was your Church before *Luther*? As if we must not own a manifest truth we find in Scripture, unlesse we can produce teachers of it in former dayes, and societies of professors of it that were not wicked. Yet I gave for answer some instances of some societies now in *London*, 500. years ago in *France*, and some later in *Germany*. As for those now in *London*, Mr. *B.* saies, 1. *They are not yet come to the proof; when they have reached to the end of what they are tending to, then it will be seen what they will prove, if they do not return and repent.* Answ. What he meanes by the end of what the societies in *London* under baptisme (I mean) are tending to I know not. If he mean Levelling, or Ranting, or universal grace, they have as much for their number and quality opposed them as any other in *London*; if he know any other dangerous end they aime at, it were fit it should be named, that their designe may be prevented: if not, who can interpret this speech of Mr. *B.* but as from a man out of a settled hatred to the opinion unwilling to hope well of the persons, against the rule of charity, 1 *Cor.* 13.7. which hopeth all things in them for the future whom he knows not for present to be desperately bad, which he will not say of the Churches of Anabaptists in *Germany*, *Holland*,

Holland, England, of whom Mr. *B.* in his book againſt Mr. *Bedford* page 310. ſaith thus: *Yea what will you ſay to all the Churches of the Anabaptiſts in* Germany, Holland, England, *&c. Have none of them grace till baptized? Are you ſure ſo many thouſands are all unpardoned, or that God is not wont to pardon them and give them grace? I dare not think ſo uncharitably of them.* And after *Who dare think that it is* (of the Anabaptiſts) *ſuch an error as excludeth them from grace?* There have been ſocieties of them for a great while, though ſomewhat latent afore theſe times, and of them many of the leaders are fallen aſleep in the Lord, many remain unblameable in reſpect of their faith and life. And therefore why Mr. *B.* ſhould ſo forebode as he doth the wicked end of the ſocieties remaining I know no reaſon but his ill opinion of them. But ſhould God in his juſt judgement let it fall out ſo that they ſhould prove wicked, as ſome Churches, yea the moſt famous, as the ſeven in *Aſia* have done, which have begun well and ended ill, it is no certain evidence againſt their doctrine, ſith their miſcarriages may come from other cauſes, whereof here and *Examen* part. 2. ſect. 5. ſome are aſſigned by me, and are ſuch as have befallen others as well as they. 2. Saith Mr. *B. It is hard with your cauſe when you cannot name one ſociety of them that ever lived in the world that proved not wicked, except thoſe now alive whoſe ends we yet ſee not.* Anſw. 1. It were not hard with our cauſe though we name no ſociety or perſon before our ſelves that were Antipedobaptiſts as long as we have the Scripture for it. 2. If I could not name one ſociety, yet there may be many, we have but obſcure intelligence of many Churches in the Eaſt and other places. The Georgians children or the Chriſtians children of *Cholcis* ſay *Heylin* in his *Geography* in the deſcription of *Armenia*, out of *Brerewood*, *Alex. Roſſe* in his cenſure of *religio medici, &c. are not baptized till they be eight years old*: How they live, what they be we have no clear intelligence probably honeſt though poore Chriſtians. The certain ſtate of them in *London* is not known to many, much leſſe the ſtate of thoſe farre off. 3. We have ſeen the ends of many of the ſocieties to have been bleſſed, and how otherwiſe we now alive ſhould ſee the end of a ſucceſſive ſociety, I do not well conceive, until is be quite diſſolved. Mr. *B.* addes. 3. *If I were never ſo able to anſwer this, yet as the world goes it is not ſafe to ſpeak all or half the wickedneſſe of the Anabaptiſts now living, which the hiſtory of this age will ſpeak to poſterity.* Anſw. 1. Why it ſhould not be ſafe for Mr. *B.* to ſpeak half the wickedneſſe of the Anabaptiſts now living, I cannot divine, except it be, becauſe if he or others ſpeak of them while they

they live they may be convinced of lying, as *Beza* did the tale of his dying a Papist. They are not so many, nor so formidable in power, or so spiteful in spirit that it should be unsafe for Mr. *B.* to tell the world he knowes of them. However me thinks of any man Mr. *B.* being according to his declaration of himself in such expectations of death as neare, and so resolute to speak truth, should not be moved by the unsafenesse of speaking truth. Yea if Mr. *B.* should speak all he could, I think he should not more exasperate them then he hath done part. 2. chap. 14. Those that sit at the Helme I cannot yet learne have such hard thoughts of them as Mr. *B.* And he that reades Mr. *Edwards Gangrena*, Mr. *Baillee his Anabaptisme*, and other writings, may imagine that if there were worse matters to charge them with, they would not be spared in this age, especially by those that are out of their reach. After-Historians may relate as partially as the present, and therefore I shall not think it lawful to condemne them upon such dark intimations as this, but think the better of them till their wickednesse be laid open. 4. Saith Mr. *B.* *Yet if you had named that society that are not guilty of schisme and demolishing the Church by division and contempt and reproach of the godly, ministry and disobedience to those in government, further then they please them, and covenant-breaking, and neglect of the Lords day, &c. you would credit the particular society if you make it good. In the mean time I see them rolling down the hill so fast that I think many have but one step lower to go.* Answ. Schisme was imputed to Protestants by Papists, for their not joining in their corruptions with them, by Prelatists to non-conformists, for not yielding to ceremonies of Bishops. *Cousel* in his *preface to his answer to* Burges, *accused the most moderate of them, as making a rent in the Church, and breaking from the Bishops* (even in that where in they were very passive) *choosing rather to forsake their function and calling then to yield conformity to the ceremonies of the Church.* Allen and Shepherd *answered* Mr. Bull page 27. *that not to have Readers read Service with or over such as have received but in a manner heathenish, is schisme.* I confesse it is too true, that it is hard to name any society of Anabaptists or Infant-baptists that are not in a schisme, and commonly both parties guilty of making the breach. I am conscious to my selfe of using what means I could for reformation without schisme, if possible, but I finde (it as many times is) impossible: yet Mr. *B.* is not ashamed to tell the world in print, that he hath as good evidence that I am a Sect-Master, as that I am a Christian. I made to Mr. *M.* in the *Epistle* of my *Beames* as faire motions as I could devise, yea such as a holy sweet spirited man and understanding did much rejoice to

read, and blessed God for it alone I sent it to Mr. *M.* Yet Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Ley* interpreted them as the challenge of a *braving Goliath.* I was desirous to see Mr. *Bs.* arguments in writing. He would not, but prints in a way that proclaimes to the world, that he looses on me and all the societies of Antipædobaptists as persons intolerable. Infant-baptisme we see to be a manifest corruption, we know it hath no precept or example expresse or virtual in Scripture, that it with infant-communion began some ages from Christs birth upon the conceit of necessity to save an infant from perishing: we know it is a duty to be baptized, yea by Christ made a concurring requisite to salvation with believing, *Marke* 16.16. and so a fundamental by Mr. *Bs.* rule in his addition to the preface of the second part of his *Saints everlasting rest*, where he defines Fundamentals *These things which God hath made the conditions of salvation.* Infant-baptizers will not baptize believers, yea they inveigh, abhorre both the opinion and practise we conceive a necessary important duty. We can scarce come to their meetings, but we must heare the truth bitterly declaimed against, persons that hold it reviled, error published, infant-baptisme practised; if we be silent we are judged to consent, if we speake it makes an uproare: we are painted out so deformed as that men are almost afraid to have speech with us, or to hear us, or to joine in communion with us. Magistrates are by writings and Sermons incited against us. I know not what we can do lesse then be baptized as Christ appoints, and receive the Lords Supper. Mr. *B.* page 341. *counts the error of the old and new Socinians denying the continuance of baptisme as a standing ordinance in the Church, nothing so bad as my opinion, upon a frivolous pretence as if I made void the end of baptisme in that wherein the true end of baptisme is preserved, which is that the baptized engageth himself to be Christs disciple.* So that even as the rigid Lutherans for their Consubstantiation had rather joine with Papists then Calvinists, Mr. *B.* is more willing to comply with that Antichristian, and I had almost said Atheistical way of living above ordinances, then favour Anabaptists. In this case if there be schisme in our practise, let all the world judge whether we be not passive rather then active, and whether the true cause of it be in us, or Mr. *Bs.* and others invectives and actings against us. We make not schisme, but suffer it: Mr. *B.* by this last book hath done more to promote it then any Anabaptist I know, and how farre the wayes of other Antagonists have been from peace, the intelligent will perceive though I be silent. *Contempt and reproach of Godly Ministers* by men of opposite parties, is very frequent and mutual. I have often endeavoured, but cannot expresse it: yet that

so-

societies of Anabaptists as they are a body do so I do not find. As for *obedience to Governours further then they please them*, the moderne so called Anabaptists in *England* and *Holland* may vye with their adversaries. The accidents of this year in *England* which I am unwilling to mention, may serve to wipe away the reproach of Anabaptists in this respect. *Covenant-breaking* till instance be given wherein is so general a charge that an answer cannot be given. I know men are taken to break Covenant who conceive they keep it. *Neglect of the Lords day* I think cannot be charged on the societies of Anabaptists, however it may be on some members. Some of the leaders of them appear sound in this point. Mr. *Blackwood Apostol. bapt. The Jewish Sabbath being put to an end*, Col. 2. 16. *we observe the Lords day from the Apostles example, and the morality of the fourth Com. which requires one day in seven.* Mr. Edward Harrison *Pædobapt. oppugned* page 4. *makes the rule for one day in seven moral and natural, and the altering the day simply Evangelical from Apostolical example, which having not meerly temporary reason is enough to prove an institution from Christ, which sort of proof we have*, Acts 20. 7. 1 *Cor.* 16. 1, 2. Mr. *B.* knowes the Protestant Churches beyond-sea more guilty of looseness in opinion and practise about the Lords day then English Anabaptists. When Mr. *B.* speaks *of their rolling down the hill so fast in placing their religion in full mouth'd oathes and blasphemies, &c.* it is very hard for Mr. *B.* to charge that upon them, which is the act of some particular persons whom they condemne, and warne others of, and whereof not a few have been of other societies then theirs. My second instance 500. years ago I have vindicated before. My third instance is of societies at this day in the Low Countreys, and Mr. *B.* answers about them, of whom *Bullinger* and others wrote who were dead before they were borne, which is not to the businesse. Yet Mr. *B.* might consider that it is confessed that even then *Menno Simonis* detested *Muncer & Becold*, as *Becman. Exercit. Theol.* 21. page 359, 362. acknowledgeth that even then there were *aliqui innocentiâ vitæ commendabiles*, commendable for their innocency of life, as *Heresbachius* relates *Histor. Anabapt.* monast. c. 8. and those at this day it's likely are not guilty of much scandal in practise, when *Cloppenburg. Gangr. Anabapt. disput.* 148. *Amsling. dial. thes.* 2. *Mr.* Paget *defence of Church-govern.* part. 2. ch. 4. who lived neare them, make it their fault that they are strict in excommunicating for small matters, and *Clappenburg*, in the *Epistle Dedicatory to his Gangrene faith*, *The troopes of Anabaptists that dwelt in Friesland after the commotions at Munster, although they trouble not the*

Common-wealth

Common-wealth having cast off corporal weapons, yet they suffer not the more pure reformed Churches to be edified without daily conflicts. From whence I gather that their converſation there is as other mens, ſaving for their rigid diſcipline and different opinions: in the moſt whereof whether truly or falſly charged on them by *Cloppenburgius*, they are not owned by thoſe in *England* whoſe *Confeſſion* is extant. To Mr. *B.* charging of me *of untruth, and covetouſneſſe, and malice, and contempt of my brethren* page 202, 203. there is an anſwer made before and after where ſpeeches and practiſes to prove theſe are objected. He charg th me *with pride in my uſual way of putting off the authority of their arguments and judgements with a contemptuous ſmile, or wonder at the ſilineſſe of them.* But therein there is no deſpiſing of their perſons, but onely of their arguments: which if I know to be weak I dare not make ſhew as if I counted them ſtrong: that were to put darkneſſe for light, and if I do ſhew diſlike with a ſmile or wonder (though others rather ſay I do reject them with anger miſtaking my earneſtneſſe in ſpeaking for that paſſion) this is uſually leſſe offenſive, then alteration of wordes. And if I uſe wondering at their ſilineſſe, I am ſure Mr. *B.* is not behind me in this book, whoſe frequent exclamations of ſilineſſe, &c. are to be ſeene where he had little or no cauſe but the defect of his own apprehenſion, as ſhall appear in the examining his book, and therefore if for this I be judged proud Mr. *B.* ſhould do well to ſearch himſelf who differs from the moſt learned and godly in the world in more things then I do, and I imagine with more peremptorineſſe and leſſe evidence then I bring from my adverſaries own confeſſions. *Perfidiouſneſſe he chargeth me not with: it is a great queſtion in this age whether it be a ſin.* Anſw. I think it is no queſtion whether breaking of Covenants and oathes be a ſin: but whether the not ſetling uniformity according to the advice of the Aſſembly at Weſtminſter, the not conjoining with the Scots, the engagement to the preſent government, &c. be perfidiouſneſſe or no. Wherein if Mr. *B.* hold the affirmative, it's very probable there will be found ſome to encounter with him, when his arguments are ſeen in writing. What he tells me, *that my not reproving the prophaning the Lords day, and excuſing my ſelf from reſolving the queſtion concerning its morality hath no good favour*, is a charge which I imagine comes from ſome tale brought Mr. *B.* whereby he is abuſed. I have ſpoken againſt prophaning the Lords day as I have judged meet in the places I have preached: my judgement about its morality is ſuccinctly ſet down *Examen* part 2. ſect. 8. At *Bewdley* I did often in my prefaces before I began morning-exerciſes at the chappel on the Lords day preſſe them to th: obſervation of it, and in my Cureſory Ex-

Exposition of the three first chapters of the Revelation on publique fast dayes, and of *Genesis* on the Lords day, delivered my self more fully in opening *Gen.* 2. 3. *Revel.* 1. 10. And when the question was propounded in the weekly meeting we had to edifie one another, *Whether the observation of every first day of the week as a Sabbath, be of Divine institution?* I resolved it at the next meeting *affirmatively*. And after I had in one or two Lectures (for so I may call my dictates at *Bewdley* in resolving their hard questions) cleared the termes, 1. Concerning the measure of the first day of the week, examining whether precisely 24. houres, and when to begin, and when to end, are necessary for the account of the time, resolving it to be measured for observation as we do other dayes for working, allowing time for necessities. 2. Concerning the observation of a Sabbath, what is requisite thereto; wherein I resolved that it is to be observed by rest and holinesse, about both which I resolved many cases. At the next time I drew the substance of my proof into this one syllogisme. If solemne worship of God in full congregations be required of God, and fixed dayes be necessary thereto, and observed by all or most Nations even Heathens, nor belongs it to any but God to appoint it to his service, and God appointed a seventh day Sabbath from the beginning, and commanded it in the fourth Commandement among the morals, and the Apostles distinguished from other dayes the Lords day by title, precept and example, as appropriate to God, and Christians with common consent so took it, and used it after their dayes the Jewish Sabbaths being abrogated, then the observation of every first day of the week as a Sabbath is of Divine institution. But solemn worship of God, &c. *Ergo*. The sequel of the Major I stood not long in proving, supposing some morality of a Sabbath being infolded in the first institution and the fourth Commandement and the Apostles fixing that on the Lords day, is a sufficient declaration of Gods mind to have it observed. But the Minor I proved by parts. And after I had proved the two first Propositions, by reason first of the failing of the meeting through some sad accidents, and then the removing of my dwelling & books, and my seldome being with them, I did not prosecute it till one moved that I would resolve them about that question, whether it were to tempt me or otherwise they know who had a hand in it. I told them what I had done already, and that of what I had begun, I had not any breviate about me, but I conceived that in my study I had, and therefore I desired their respite till my next comming to them, that I might by reviewing what I had done and adding some further reading of my self to resolve them: in which they seemed to rest, but it's likely some or other told Mr. *B.* of this, who

I perceive wanted not tale-bearers, and he *in imagine* sticks not to interpret this my respite (which he calls an excuse from resolving the question concerning the morality of the Lords day, though I had long before resolved it, but had not fully confirmed my argument) as having some ill savour of licentiousnesse, though about a moneth after I repaired to them, and so fully confirmed the other seven Propositions, that the company (who were as many of the best-affected and intelligent there as the roome could hold) declared themselves satisfied thereabout. Mr. *B.* also page 258. saies of my exceptions against one story in the book of *Gods judgements on Sabbath-breakers, he is jealous lest it be from no good will to the doctrine of the morality of the Christian Sabbath, as being against the scope of the book*, though the occasion shew it was onely to prove the uncertainty of relations, that men may not rest on them as proofes of a truth. But I perceive as Mr. *B.* is very prone to have hard thoughts of me, so both he and Mr. *M.* seek advantage to create prejudice against me about this point of the Lords day, which makes me more full in my clearing my self in this thing, and in other things, not so much regarding my own personal ends me, as desirous to prevent that indirect way of wounding the truth through my sides. I would have no man adhere to my tenet because it's mine, nor would I have any to reject it because it is mine. I know too much evil by my self, yet not in the things in which I am accused, at least not in that degree in which Mr. *B.* accuseth me. Mr. *B.* s telling me in print this manner of crimes not proved, but imagined is no whit justified by the rules and examples he brings: his ranking me with seducers I defy, and know that I shall better be able to prove it against him, then he against me.

SECT. XVI.

The ground of my opposing infant-baptism is confirmed by Mr. B. himself.

PAge 205. *He tells me, all the Ministers and schollers that he can meete with, that heard my disputes, did think I had silly grounds to build my confidence in; and though I boast much of my answers by writing, he thinks my writings have little to be boasted of.* Answ. I have some experience of Ministers and Schollers, and I find few fit to judge of controversies,

traversies, and of those few not many willing to search impartially into a point that's against the streame, and likely to expose them to hard measure: some that talke much study little, nor is it a new thing to find some that wrangle in dispute for such a sense of a Scripture as when they are out of the heat of dispute they themselves expound otherwise. The Ministers and Schollers at the dispute, such as they were, weigh but little with them that know them best. My writings are not boasted of by me, yet men equal to Mr. *B.* or any auditors of the dispute have said more of them then I am willing to speak of. My imployment in this argument seemes to me to be part of my work God hath allotted me, though I am known not to be idle in other work. What Mr. *B. calls fallacies passing from me*, will be proved verities. My arguments from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Marke* 16. 15, 16. are to be found in my *Exercit.* sect. 13. *Examen* part. 4. sect. 1. to which Mr. *M.* replies are insufficient as I shall shew in my *Review*. In the worship of God it was wont to be accounted a certain rule, that Gods worship should be observed according to his appointment and no otherwise. And so Protestant Divines argue from 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. selfe-examiners are appointed to eate, *Ergo* no infants or younglings, though young ones ate the Passeover. Yea Mr. *B.* himself page 212. *If Christ never sent any but Ministers to baptize then no others may do it. If there be no example of any but Ministers that have baptized* (though parents did circumcise) *then no others may do it*: (*For the Apostles established the Church according to Gods mind, and the Scripture is a sufficient rule*) page 212. *If there be no command or example in Scripture of any but Ministers administring the Lords Supper then no others may do it*. Page 341. *If we have no warrant by word or example in all the New Testament* (*since the solemne institution of baptisme*, Mat. 28.) *to admit any member into the Church without baptisme, but both percept and example of admitting them by it: then we must not admit any without it* (*ordinarily*) I take his own *medium mutatis mutandis*, and thence inferre, *If we have no warrant by word or example in all the New Testament* (*since the solemne institution of baptisme* Mat. 28.) *to admit any member into the Church by baptisme but believers by profession, but both precept and constant example of admitting them by it, then we must not admit any without it* (*ordinarily*) I use his own words and texts. *But the Antecedent is evident*, John 4. 1. Acts 2. 38, 41. and 8. 12, 13, 16, 36, 38. and 9. 18. and 10. 47, 48. and 16. 15, 33. and 18. 8. and 19. 5. Rom. 6. 3. &c. *the Consequent is ordained to those that take the word for their rule*. If Mr. *B.* will stand to his own argument he must

make good my arguing from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Marke* 16. 15, 16. unlesse he have some such strange shift as Mr. *Cotton* puts in the mouth of *Silvanus* (who personates himself) in his book intitled, *The grounds and ends of baptisme in the Preface* page 3. where he intimates *that the urging against childrens baptism this main principle of purity and reformation, to wit* [*that no duty of Gods worship nor any ordinance of religion is to be administred in the Church but such as hath just warrant from the word of God*] *is from Satan, but from God when it is urged against the Prelatists and Papists*: so Mr. *B.* thinks his *medium* good against Socinians, but not (though it be the same) for the Anabaptists. He addes, *All your confident words shew me not the least ground for your conclusion no more then thus: Scripture requireth faith to justification, therefore none but believers are justified: which is false, yet like yours, if I know what you would thence deduce.* Answ. He now I hope knowes what and how I deduce, or rather how Mr. *B.* deduceth my conclusion from *Mat.* 28. 19. *Marke* 16. 15, 16. not onely in my words, but also his own (though I had often long before deduced my argument in the places before quoted, and elsewhere in my writings) of the validity of which deduction I am the more confident, because it is in Mr. *Bs.* own words justly brought by me against himself. *If the Scripture requireth faith of all to justification*, then it is not false *that none but believers are justified.* Yet infants may be justified by habitual faith or actual by operation in an extraordinary way: But the Scripture requires profession of faith afore any be baptized ordinarily. As for what may be done extraordinarily elsewhere I have expressed my self, and have vindicated my self from the wrong inferences made thence *Postscript* sect. 15. and elsewhere. Page 206. *The People of* Kederminster *did not heare from my mouth in the dispute* Jam. 1. *How little Anabaptists could say in the hardest point of baptisme*: for I used no such wordes, nor any thing I said or omitted to say can inferit: and when they have read my answer me thinks they should believe I could say more then I did say then, and see the reason why no more was said then. It is a meere Calumny that he saith, *I chose out the weakest arguments or urged some that were strong in a way of my own, and then triumphed and answered as weakely in my Sermons.* To my best understanding I chose out the best arguments I found in Mr. *M.* Mr. *G.* Dr. *H.* M. *Drew*, Mr. *Blake*, Mr. *Cobbet*, and some others, and that for the most part in their own words, which that I might not mistake I read in the pulpit, & therefore what ever my answers were, I am sure it is an untruth that *I chose out the weakest arguments, and urged some that were strong in a*

way of my own. When I threatned Mr. *B.* with the danger he went in for oppoſing me, unleſſe it were from God for oppoſing truth I know not, and therefore take this ſuppoſed threatning of mine to be either his, or his tale-tellers fiction.

SECT. XVII.

The groſſe abſurdities to which Mr. B. vaunted I was driven in the diſpute, were not ſo as he imagined.

PAge 207. He makes a catalogue of my abſurdities at the diſpute, to which (being the chief thing he charged me with in the Epiſtle to the people of *Kederminſter*) I anſwer. The firſt and ſecond will be ſhewed to be no abſurdities in examining the firſt part of his book chap. 6. The third is no abſurdity, underſtanding it of viſible membership by profeſſion of their own, in which notion I ſaid in the diſpute I underſtood viſible Church-membership, as commonly Proteſtant Divines do. Upon what occaſion the fourth and many other of them were ſpoken by me (if they were ſpoken by me) I cannot remember, nor what limitations or explications I then uſed, but this I conceive was my meaning, that infants of the Jewes were not viſible Church-members in the wilderneſſe in that manner they were when they had circumciſion, that is, by their viſible particular note or mark, and yet then they were viſible in the lump, the whole congregation being then Gods viſible Church: in which ſenſe they were then viſible, and ſo the women too who were not circumciſed. And when I ſaid no infant can be ſaid to be a viſible Church-member without ſome act of his own: I meant it of viſibility according to the note of viſibility in the Chriſtian Church. Which things being rightly underſtood, there was neither abſurdity, nor contradiction in my ſpeeches, nor any thing againſt conſcience, not deſerving ſuch deriſion as was in Mr. *B.* and his colleagues, though perhaps through diſtraction of thoughts chiefely occaſioned by Mr. *B.*, concealing the notion in which he uſed the terme [viſible] which I often in vain aſſayed to underſtand from him, or forgetfulneſſe, or ſcantneſſe of words I did not expreſſe my ſelf clearly. This is anſwer ſufficient about the fourth, fifth, ſixth, ſeventh, eighth, nineth, ſixteenth pretended abſurdities. The tenth a candid man would have conceived rather to have been *lapſum linguæ*, a ſlip of ſpeech, then *errorem mentis*, a fault of mind,

and that however a mistake might slip from me (a thing very incident to the most learned in the heat of dispute, yea sometimes in preaching, conference and writing) yet I meant [visibility] to be the adjunct, and the persons visible to be the subject. The eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth I conceive no absurdities, the Church-visibility of infants then being from that imperfect Church-frame, which was to continue onely till Christ came, and was clogged with many burdens, which by Christs coming all were mercifully freed from, as, to go up to Jerusalem thrice a year, &c. without any losse of mercy to infants, though it were for a time a mercy to them: which will be more fully cleared (God assisting) in answering Mr. *Bs.* argument p. 1. chap. 6. The fourteenth is no absurdity, as I then to my best remembrance expressed it, though Mr. *Bs.* juvenility thought fit to make sport with it, that the elect people of the Jews were natural (not as Mr. *B.* sets it down naturally) that is according to nature, in that they were descended from *Abraham* (the roote of the Church of believers) by natural generation, and so natural branches, yet not by nature, that is, natural abilities or works of their own, but by grace as the efficient cause, *Rom.* 11. ver. 5, 6. To conceive it, the olive there notes a race of men who were the Church of believers, which because after *Abraham* the roote it was first in the Jewish Nation, is called their own olive: ver. 24. Of which *Abraham* is ver. 16, 18. made the roote bearing two sorts of branches, some ingraffed who were the Gentile believers, some natural the Jewes, and he is a roote under a double habitude, one as a natural Father, and another as Father of believers. Both sorts of branches are by the Apostle made to stand in *Abraham* the roote as branches of the Church of believers or the invisible, the one natural in that they were not proselyted or ingraffed, but came of *Abraham* by natural generation, the other proselyted or ingraffed by believing παρὰ φύσιν, besides the natural way of descent from *Abraham*, yet both united in *Abraham* the common roote of believers, and in the olive-tree the Church of believers, as particular branches thereof: yet neither by nature, that is, by vertue of natural generation, as the Apostle determines, *Rom.* 9. 8. but by election of grace, *Rom.* 11. 5, 6. And whereas Mr. *B.* tells me, *Rom.* 11. 24. sayes both, he is mistaken. For 1. it is not said that any was a branch of the roote *Abraham* by nature, but that the ingraffed branches were antecedently to their ingraffing in the olive wild by nature: nor is it said of the branches from the roote that are called natural, that they were branches in the true olive by nature, as Mr. *B.* would have it to prove them of the visible Church by nature: but that they were branches of that olive or race of men who were not wilde by nature, that

is

is Gentiles bringing no fruit to God, but of that olive which was descended from *Abraham* by natural generation, which was the Church of God till broken off. 2. Whereas the translation turnes κατὰ φύσιν ver. 21, 24. by [natural] and once ver. 24. [by nature] yet it is the same terme κατὰ φύσιν in all. 3. It is not true that the Jewes in the translation of ver. 24. are said to be branches by nature. And for the fifteenth absurdity it is no absurdity: they are called natural onely in respect of their descent as men from *Abraham*, but not as branches in the olive-tree. And this is clear. For the ingrafted branches can be said to be no otherwise παρὰ φύσιν besides nature, but in that they were not descended from *Abraham* by natural generation, and therefore on the contrary the Jews are natural branches, not as believers, but as men descended from *Abraham* by natural generation. The seventeenth absurdity is a relation of a speech of mine that Mr. *B. cannot finde one Author expounding* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *of infants Covenant-holinesse in his sense before* Luther, *and* Zuinglius; *and then asketh is this true?* I answer, I think it is, and if he can produce any one, me thinks he should have done it in his book. If he do, he will do more then Mr. *M.* friend better versed as I conceive in Antiquity then Mr. *B.* hath done, though attempting it page 21. of Mr. *M.* Defence of his Sermon. Two places he cites; one in *Tertullian*, which I have answered in my *Apology* page 85. The other in *Athanasius qu.* 114. *ad Antiochum*, as teaching infant-baptisme by vertue of federal holinesse from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. But, 1. The Author is confessedly spurious, by *Rivet. Critic. Sac.* l. 3. c. 6. *Scultetus part.* 2. *Medul.* Patr. l. 1. c. 42. *Perkins Preparat. to the Demonstr. of the probleme. The works falsely impos'd on Athanasius are these. The book of divers questions of the Holy Scripture unto King* Antiochus; *for therein great* Athanasius *is cited.* Yet Mr. *M.* or his friend hath these words *ubi supra. These wordes then which are safe and sound, grounded upon the same Scripture which I have much insisted on are read in the works of* Athanasius: *where the question is about infants dying requiring a resolution, that might clearely set whether they go to be punished or to the Kingdome. The answer is, seeing the Lord said, Suffer little children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdome of heaven. And the Apostle sayes, Now your children are holy (observe the Gospel-ground the same that I build upon) it is manifest that the infants of believers which are baptized do as unspotted and faithfull enter into the Kingdome. This assertion is owned by all the reformed Churches.*] But had Mr. *M.* or his friend recited the words fully then it would have appeared how impertinently the words are alleadged to prove the

the baptizing of infants by vertue of federal holines from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. & that none of the Reformed Churches would own the doctrine of that Author, being built on no Gospel-ground, but Popish opinion of *Limbus infantum*. For the entire words are these *Qu.* 114. *ad Antiochum, Whither go dying infants to punishment or the Kingdome? and where are the infants of believers dying unbaptized disposed, with the believers or unbelievers?* Answ. *The Lord saying, Suffer little children to come: for of such is the Kindome of heaven, and again the Apostle saying, But now are your children holy, it is manifest that the infants of believers baptized go into the Kingdome as unspotted and believing: but the unbaptized and Heathenish neither go into the Kingdome nor into punishment: for they have done no sin.* Which answer plainly determines that infants of believers if baptized enter into the Kingdome: but neither the unbaptized infants of believers or Heathens enter into the Kingdome or punishment; for they have done no sin. Not a word of federal holinesse, but the plain Popish doctrine that infants dying unbaptized go to *limbus infantum*, but the baptized into the Kingdome of heaven: which is the same with the doctrine father'd on *Justin Martyr.* qu. 56. *ad orthod.* Now this is contrary to what the reformed Churches assert even from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that the children of believers are federally holy afore baptisme, and go into the Kingdome though they die unbaptized. Nor doth the alleadging 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. prove that the Author observed the Gospel-ground (more truly Antievangelical or Jewish) which Mr. *M.* buildeth on. For the holinesse in that Author is meant either of holinesse in possibility in being likely to be baptized, because believing parents would likely breed them up in Christianity and they be baptized, in which sense *Tertull. de anima* c. 39. expoundes the Apostle as calling them holy not in act barely by descent from a believer, but because *designati sanctitatis*, or as *Hieronim. Epist.* 153. *ad Paulinum* alledging *Tertullian de monogamia, quod candidati sint fidei et nullis idololatriæ sordibus polluantur*, which *Erasmus* in his glosse on *Hierom.* renders thus, *quod velut ambiunt et exspectant baptismum*; or else of actual holinesse in being baptized, believers being wont to baptize their infants when neare danger of death not by reason of Covenant-holinesse, but the giving of grace by baptisme, and the necessity of it to save an infant from perishing. I am still confident that neither Father nor Interpreter preceding the sixteenth century did interpret 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. of holinesse of separation to God as visible Church-members by Gods Covenant to them: Nor doth *Chamier. panstrat. Cathol. tom.* 4. l. 5. cap. 10. bring any though he purposedly sets down the various opinions about the holinesse

there

there meant, and sayes *omnes complecti conabor & examinare sententias.* Sure I am *Augustin. tom.7. l.2.de pecc. mer. & remiss.* c.26.saith, *Ac per hoc & illa sanctificatio cujuscunq; modi sit quam in filiis fedelium esse dixit Apostolus, id istam de baptismo & de peccati origine vel remissione omnino non pertinet: nam & conjuges infideles in conjugibus fidelibus sanctificari dicit eo ipso loco, &c.* Unto which I think good to adde, that whereas Mr. *M.* in his Defence page 10. 58. brings in the Pelagians acknowledging that infants were baptized *secundum sententiam Evangelii*, which he imagines to be the Gospel-ground (as he calls it) of federal holinesse from the Covenant to the believer and his seed in *Aug. tom.7.l.2. contra Pelag. & Cœlest.* c.5. That he hadadded the next words [*quia Dominus statuit regnum Cœlorum non nisi baptizatis posse conferri*] it would have appeared, that the Gospel he meant was *John* 3. 5. which with *Rom.* 5.12. was elleadged in those dayes as a reason of the Churches tradition of infant-baptisme, and no other reason can I finde for infant-baptisme, nor in any the exposition of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. in Mr. *Ms.* or Mr. *Bs.* sense till *Zwinglius* his dayes. The eighteenth absurdity is, that I said *the word ἐξουσία is taken many hundred times for authority, and askes is that true?* To which I answer, This was spoken in the dispute, when I had not time or means to collect the number of times wherein ἐξουσία is used for authority in Scripture, and therefore spake at adventure, and if I did Hyperbolize it might be neitheir absurdity nor untruth so to speak, as is frequent in speakers & writers without imputation of falshood. Nevertheless I find it used above an hundred times in the New Testament, in *Matthew* 10. and 6. of them it is traslated authority, and in most places where it is translated power, it might be translated authority, and if it be used for liberty in any of these places, yet it is no where used for a veile but one, 1. *Cor.* 11. 10. and I doubt not but it is used for authority, or power, or liberty many hundreds of times in the Lxx Greek of the old Testament, though I have not a Greek Concordance of the old Testament, to number them by, and therefore there is neither absurdity, nor untruth in any speech any more then in that *John* 21.15. though I conceive there is scarce need of an hyperbole to verifie it, but am sure Mr. *B.* trifles in putting this into the score of my absurdities to which I was driven. To the nineteenth I do not remember *I said, the Corinthians doubted whether their living together were fornication.* My resolution and exposition of the Apostles words will be made good against this exception, in answering Mr. *Bs.* fifth argument c. 29. of the first part, which I intend to fit for the presse with as much speed as I [illegible] To the twentieth I have in my *Examen* of Mr. *Ms. Sermon*, [illegible]

Ans-

Antidote and Review ſhewed a ground of neceſſity to take the Apoſtles words, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. in my ſenſe, not in Mr. *Bs.* the reply to which made by Mr. *B.* will appear to be inſufficient upon the examination of chap. 29. of the firſt part of his book. The one & twentieth abſurdity which Mr. *B.* would faſten on my arguing *as moſt abſurd, and like a right Anabaptiſt* (in his ſcoffing language) is meerly from his miſtake of my expreſſion, as if by *preſent prayer* I meant prayer coexiſtent and continued during the uſe of the thing ſanctified: whereas my meaning was to exclude an habit of prayer without the act, and actual prayer interrupted in its courſe, through lapſe into ſuch ſin as *Davids* adultery, in which time things are not ſanctified to real believers till repentance reſtore their ſanctifying exerciſe. And ſo the two and twentieth and four and twentieth abſurdities which Mr. *B.* makes ſo *horrid*, are alſo anſwered, nor was the three and twentieth an abſurdity. Mr. *B.* himſelf page 98. limits the ſpeech [*all things are pure to the pure*] *that is, all things good and lawfull*; and is not this all one as to ſay [*ſome things are pure*;] nor is it unuſual to limit ſuch univerſal termes, as the matter requires, as 1 *Cor.* 13. 7. & 10. 23. &c. The twentieſith and twentieſixth were no abſurdities, but fit anſwers to ſo trifling arguments. For the terme [diſciple] importing one that hath learned, it is but trifling to argue [infants of believers are diſciples] without proving they have learned; and the reaſon why they have not learned is becauſe they are untaught; and if Mr. *B.* had further asked why they are not taugh, I would have anſwered, becauſe ordinarily uncapable, and God both not extraordinarily ſhewn them this mercy: But becauſe I perceived he was about to leave the plain way of proving them diſciples, by ſhewing that the notation and uſe of the word diſciple (which himſelf page 92. confeſſeth to come from the act of learning) did agree to them, never imagining that ridiculous ſenſe in which he takes the word [diſciple] page 14. as a relation without a foundation without actual learning for the preſent, or ſo much as an aſſay, intention or capacity to learn, and making actual learning the end of an Infants being a diſciple, who hath no thoughts of it, and that he ſought to winde about an intangling diſcourſe about Gods mercy to Infants, which though it were but frivolous in reſpect of the thing to be proved, to wit, the appliableneſſe of the word [diſciple] to Infants, yet being popular and pauſible, would be taking with the Auditors (which I quickly perceived he affected). I conceived on the ſudden the anſwers I gave fitteſt, and ſo ſtill do think. The laſt in number is no abſurdity, but if Mr. *B.* put in [actual] uſed by him in the diſpute, and underſtand it of circumciſion as acted barely, not as taught,

and put in the terme [yoke] it is Mr. *Bs.* absurdity to maintain the contrary as is proved above. And for the latter part it is no absurdity, nor seemed to *Grot. annot.* in *Mat.* 11.29. *Jugum mandata significat. Ita vox ista sumitur*, Act. 15.10. *& Johannes hunc locum explicans pro jugo ἐντολὰς dixit*, 1. Epist. 5. 3. To like purpose *Parens* in *Mat.* 11. 30. where he useth the terme *jugum doctrinæ*, the yoke of doctrine, applied to the Gospel in opposition to the yoke of the law, *Acts* 15. 10. So the *N. Annot.* on *Mat.* 11.29. *Acts* 15. 10. 1 *John* 5. 3. Piscat. on *Act.* 15.10. the yoke] *to wit, the law of* Moses *by comparing it with verse* 5. Deod. on Mat. 11. 30. *calls it the rigorous yoke of the law unsufferable without Christ, and therefore unsufferable not so much for the labour in observing it, as the imperfection to quiet the conscience, and the condemnation it bound to for not keeping it, on* Acts 15.10. My *arguing to prove the repeale of infants Church-membership* was onely *lamentable*, in that it met with such a contemptuous respondent, who judgeth that *idem, per idem*, which was rationally thus. The repeale of Church-membership was proved from the altering the Church-state from Jewish national to Christian personal, this proved from the different call, this proved from the different way God took to gather his Church in the New Testament from the Old, by preaching not authority of superiors as when he brought the family of *Abraham*, and the Jewish Nation into Covenant. What the Ministers (so called) which sate next Mr. *B.* judged I passe not. They were much deceived in their judgement about my arguing, and my being mated and puzzled then. What ever puzzling I had was in the beginning, when I was almost at a stand what to answer, and therefore varied my answers by reason of my not understanding where that ordinance of infants visible Church-membership unrepealed Mr. *B.* speakes of is, and in what sense Mr. *B.* called them visible Church-members and disciples under the Gospel, which then I understood not, nor did he explaine so as that I could clearly understand him, not so fully since by his book, but that by much diligence I am fain to pick it out by comparing one passage and expression with another. It is untrue *that not knowing what to say I was resolved to say something, lest if I were silent the people should think I were worsted*, or that *I requested him to name my absurdities: or that by private confessions or by my own confession I was conscious of absurdities I was driven to.*

Sect. XVIII.

The grosse untruths Mr. B. chargeth me with, are not such.

Page 209. Mr. *B.* chargeth me with six *grosse untruths*, though my words were not assertions, but intimations: nevertheless I conceive not any untruth in them. For, 1. However *the motion was not sudden, nor the yielding to it sudden, yet the assault was sudden*, without any rules for orderly mannaging the dispute, or notaries on both sides to take it, &c. which I imprudently ommitted, not expecting such a solemne meeting as I found, and because of the opinion I had of Mr. *B.* as more candid in taking my answers, and explaining himself, and yielding to other things which might sift the truth, then I found him. 2. It is not true, *I forced Mr. B. to the dispute.* The words of my letter dated *December* 27. 1649. foure dayes before the dispute were these. Sir, *my message was this, sith I intend on the next Lords day to prosecute what I have begun in examining the* Hypotheses, *upon which the argument from circumcision for infant-baptisme (which is the Padobaptists* Achilles) *is built, I was willing to invite you to be a hearer, and if you judged it meet to oppose what you should think good in a Logick way without Rhetorick: Yet if you choose to come over either Munday or Tuesday, I shall be ready to justifie my doctrine openly, or privately by word or writing as it shall be judged convenient.* Mr. *B.* choosing *Tuesday Jan.* 1. a seat was provided for him with some kind of State, Ministers and Schollers (such as they were) sent for over the Countrey, placed on each side Mr. *B.* which with Mr. *B.* carriage in the beginning to propound that question (which I had not then meddled with in my Sermons or printed books) about the manner of baptizing, and in that manner as served for no other purpose but to create prejudice, besides his fallacious disputing in the beginning, did cause apprehensions in me of the designe of bearing down me and the truth by indirect wayes, which before I dreamed not of: which if Mr. *B.* were not privy to yet was he instrumental to promote, which I confesse did not a little perplex me and streightned my thoughts and expressions. 3. That Mr. *B.* did *conceale his arguments* me thinks he should not deny, who denies not that he would not give me animadversions on my written notes, nor let me have his arguments in writing. To the rest of his questions answer enough is already given. 4. It *is no untruth that I had scarce time afforded me to repeale his arguments*: yea at first it was expressely denied me till Mr. *Good* informed Mr. *B.* that it

was the rule of Schools the Respondent should repeat the arguments. And it was once confessed ingenuously that Mr. *Bs.* syllogisms were so long as that they could not be easily repeated: which was very true of some of them, contrary to the use of Schools being hypothetical syllogisms to prove an hypothetical proposition. It is true that Mr. *B. would open his terme*, viz. the chief terme [visible Church-member] when I asked him by what note he meant Infants were discernable as visible Church-members, he did not tell me his note to my best remembrance, and when I did distinguish of visible by profession, or some other way, because I did not expres the other member of the distinction (though I could not do it till he explained what other way he conceived as being a visible Church-member besides profession) he derided me. 6. It is true also *that he checked me with Satyrical quips, as that he could not help my memory, when I did not repeate rightly* his long syllogisme, *hat he came not to be catechized*, when I asked him of his meaning about the terme [visible]. His speech of my defying the armies of Israel, and calling, give me a man to dispute, &c. for my uncircumcised opinion is conservant with Mr. *M.* and Mr. *Ley* their unjust and false charges of me to which I answered in my *Apology* sect. 7. and Mr. *Bs* insulting speech thereupon is not without shew of vain glory. Page 211. *He blames me for desiring his arguments in writing, though not denying the validity of any one of his reasons against writing, many mens writings being yet unanswered by me, my answer to Mr.* Ms. *Defence being weak, that I have done him great injury in forcing him to write.* Answ. The desire I and others had to see his arguments in writing, was because we could not otherwise well judge of them, which he might easily have done being those as he saith he preached at *Coventry*, and had written in his book at the dispute, and therefore might have been easily communicated to us. His reasons against writing I took to be excuses of his unwillingnesse to gratifie us in our request, and that they were meer excuses his printing proveth, to which he *was never forced by me*, as he falsely pretends in his title page, and if he be injured it is by himself, whose own minde, or some others designe using him as their instrument, carried him to it; and though I am glad to see his arguments in writing, yet I take it for the greatest injury that ever I received from man, that he hath so unworthily abused me and the truth, (which I pray God forgive him) expecting also if he live both righting me and the truth. Of answering Mr. *Cobbet* I have said enough already, Mr. *Church*, and Mr. *Rutherfords* are in effect the same with Mr. *Ms.* and others: by overthrowing in my Sermons the *Hypotheses* of the Covenant, seal, Baptisms succession

to Circumcision they were answered. Mr. *Drew's* main argument page 23. though his book by the *Author of the lawfulnesse of obeying the present government be judged to be written with sharp reasons and mild language*, yet either there are foure termes in it, or else it concludes we are to circumcise. The dispute of Mr. *Bail*, had been shewed to be very fallacious, if my letter to the press had found one willing to print it. I desired to have Mr. *Bs.* arguments in writing besides these, because he was better known to those of *Bewdley*, I compare not my self with men excellent in writing, nor do I think I used the terme [*silly people*] though Mr. *Bs.* notary so wrote it, page 212. How unseemly Mr. *Bs.* language was I have said afore. I conceived it necessary Mr. *B.* should explain his termes to satisfie the people, who could not judge of his proof without knowing his meaning, which might have been done, and yet strict disputing observed: which Mr. *B.* denied, though this were or should have been the end of the dispute, and the occasion of it led him to it. If [for peace and for fear of scandal] be equipollent (as I take them to be in these speeches) then [Truth must not be lost for fear of scandal] and [no truth is to be concealed so as to be lost for peace] differ not as much as truth *from a most destructive falsehood, as Mr.* B. *saith* page 215. *Austin* I think hath the words I cited in that Sermon, my *book of scandals* page 273. and in my *Apology* page 5. though perhaps I am mistaken, and the speech be *Gregories*, whose words in his seventh *homily* on *Ezech.* are thus cited by *Aqu.* 2. 2. q. 43. art. 7. *Si de veritate scandalum sumitur ut tilius nasci permittur scandalum quam veritas relinquatur.* My traducing Mr. *B.* in my pulpit, mentioned page 217. was nothing but citing his words, which was not frequent, nor is it, if rightly done, any injury when the book is published. What is of me and not of God I pray with him may perish: of schism or zeal for it I am not conscious: that truth I avouch will stand when Mr. *Bs.* rotten pillars fall to the ground. To many questions and charges in sundry pages 213. &c. an answer may be gathered from what is said before.

SECT. XIX.

The six imagined errors charged on me by Mr. B. *are cleered from his censure.*

MR. *B.* addes a confutation of six of my *pretended* errors. The first was onely a speech of mine in conference on occasion of Mr. *Bs.* words

words in a Sermon which were taken to be a fling at me, and my meaning was this, that the truth I maintained and such like being about a thing of frequent practise, so that by reason of ignorance sin will be committed, were not to be concealed when if it be it is like to be lost for the peace of the Church, that is to prevent differences in opinion and the breaches in communion that by reason thereof do by accident from the corruption of men fall out. Mr. *B.* opposeth it, as if I meant a *man must not suspend any truth of the Scripture, no not though a total breach bringing bloodshed, ruine, &c. follow*; yea by his last argument he would insinuate, as if it would follow on my tenet, *that every one that doth but think it is a truth that Christ is not God, that there is no God, &c. that he will think himself bound to reveale it to the world, though it turne all to confusion*, and after his satyrical veine saith, *He that had rather see the Church in this case then his doctrine of Anabaptistry should be conceal'd, is good for nothing but to make an Anabaptist of that I know.* To which I answer, my meaning in that speech of mine was this, that no truth of God that a person is certain is such, and can demonstrate so to be, which concernes the faith or practise of Christians, through concealing of which they shall erre and sin, is to be concealed when a person may perceive by circumstances, that if he conceale it at such a time the contrary will be established, and so truth be lost in the eye of reason, though much trouble follow thereon. And this I resolved heretofore in my book of scandals chap. 4. sect. 20. not that I know of excepted against by any ground on *Pauls* words, *Gal.* 2. 5. avouched by many Divines, and without which the Waldenses, Hussites, Protestants will be condemned for opposing the Monkish profession, halfe communion, &c. though warres followed thereon. And our present and former non-conformists will be deeply guilty of sin in opposing the Prelacy, ceremonies, canons, &c, which hath been one cause of the great troubles of the land, which have proved greater then any raised by the Anabaptists. And so far as many prudent men can discerne, many of the Presbyterian Ministers of the land, do as little regard the peace of this land at this time, through discontent that they want the establishment of discipline after their mind, as any Anabaptist heretofore did. And I presume they that sit at the sterne do find the so called Anabaptists as faithfull to the publique cause as their opposites.

As for the two next errors about others then Ministers baptizing and administring the Lords Supper, Mr. *B.* delivers as much himself as the errors pretended affirm in these words page 221. *In a case of necessity* (*as if people were in the Indies*) *where no Ministers can be had, if any say that it is better a*

private

private man baptize and administer the Lords Supper then wholly omit them, I will not deny it; and he gives two reasons. But saith he, Mr. *T. speaks it in reference to our ordinary case in* England. Concerning which I answer, that for baptizing it is true I speak in reference to the case in *England*; all or most of the Ministers ordained being against baptizing of persons of years sprinkled in infancy, and there lying upon them that see infant-baptisme a corruption a necessity to be baptized upon profession of faith, there is a necessity that they be baptized by persons not ordained by laying on of hands of the Presbytery, though I do conceive laying on of hands an ordinance in force from 1 *Tim.* 5. 23. and 4. 14. *Act.* 13. 3. *Heb.* 6. 2. Nor do I like the argument from *Numb.* 8. 10. to prove that non-preaching elders may lay on hands conceiving no Mosaical ordinance concerning any positive ceremonial rite belonging to the Jewish service is a rule to us now, and therefore do wish there were either by authority or consent of Churches some way of reforming it; till which I see a necessity that persons not ordained yet preachers of the Gospel do baptize. But for administring the Lords Supper though I acknowledge it most fit in many respects it should be received some Minister ordering it, not so much for the consecrating of the Elements (as they call it) by vertue of office, as for the comely and edifying dispensing of it by prayer and exhortation, the ordinance being holy, and to be performed with much reverence, to which none are so fit as a Minister that is set apart for the word and prayer: yet whereas it is claimed as a part of the Ministers office to be Minister of the Sacraments, or (as they call them) seales, and it is aggravated as if it were the sin of *Uzzah* or *Uzziah* for any else to do it, and too much I think is ascribed not only by Papists, but also by others to the power of order, and many require it as a Ministers duty to give them the Sacrament, and if Mr. *Bs.* doctrine be good in his treatise of the Saints rest page 630. Their being baptized persons or members of the universal Church, is sufficient evidence of their interest to the Supper, till they by heresie or scandal blot that evidence, Ministers cannot deny it them without injustice, and hereupon many perplexities are in Ministers about giving the Lords Supper, and perplexities in receivers from whom they receive it, it being taught that they do justifie their Ministery, and own them as their Ministers, who receive the Lords Supper from them, and it is taught that Ministers have a power to deny some the seals, and this is made a chief part of their government. Have I confessed and I think it is true, that a company of believers though they have no Minister ordained in case of want of an or-

Tertullian. de baptismo Laicis jus est baptizandi.

dained

dained Minister may some one or more in holy and seemely manner by giving thanks, praying, and declaring the end and use of that rite, and guiding the action, remember the Lords death in breaking bread, and this may be truly a Sacrament as it is called, and acceptable to God if performed with a holy heart. And my chief ground is, because whereas it is made one of the chief disorders in eating the Lords Supper at *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 11. 20, 21. that *in eating every one took his own Supper before other*, this could not have happened if they had been wont to receive it from a Minister that distributed to all; and when the Apostle to rectifie the abuse sets down *what he received of the Lord*, ver. 23. he speaks not a word of a Ministers duty to regulate them, or of Christs appointing it as a part of his office to distribute it, nor gives any direction to that end: but only ver. 33. that they *tarry one for another, and not eat till they came together*, whereas if it did then belong to the Minister to distribute, the direction should have been given to him not to distribute till they came together. If it be said (as *Saravia* against *Beza*) that there were then Presbyters at Corinth, though I conceive it not likely, but the contrary rather manifest from 1 *Cor.* 1. 7. & 6. 4. & 12. 28. & 14. 29. Yet it serves the more to confirme my opinion, that then it was not counted the Ministers office to deliver the Lords Supper, and that it might be without a Minister ordained, sith they did receive it then, 1 *Cor.* 10. 16. yet I acknowledge that it is very antient that the Minister called the President did order the Lords Supper, as I gather from *Justin Martyrs Apolog.* 2. *ad Antoninum* where he sets down the order of the Christian service in his time. And I am against the altering it because of the antiquity of the use, and the confusion likely to follow on the alteration. But being urged by Mr. *B.* and others in the manner aboveſaid, it is necessary that the point be examined. Mr. *B.* argues thus, 1. *He that administreth the Lords Supper (in breaking the bread, delivering it to all, bidding them take, eate, &c.) must represent the Lord Jesus, who did all this at the institution. But only Ministers and no private men are persons who should represent the Lord Jesus in Church-administrations. Therefore, only Ministers and no private men may administer the Lords Supper.* To which I answer, 1. [in *Church-administrations*] in the Minor, is added which was not in the Major, and so there are four termes, and the argument faulty. 2. But waving that exception, because it may be quickly rectified, I deny the Minor understanding as Mr. *B.* doth by a Minister, a Presbyter ordained by laying on of hands. For to speak of the Ruling elders Church-administrations, or the preaching of persons not in office (of which anon)

anon) It is certain that Deacons have Church-administration, who are not Presbyters; yea it is manifest out of antiquity, that the Deacons did deliver the Elements in the Lords Supper, and *Rogers* on Article 23. *of the Church of England*, prop. 3. saith, *at Geneva the elder (a lay-man) ministreth the cup ordinarily at the Communion*, and therefore Ministers did and might represent Christ at least in that part of Church-administration. But Mr. *B.* goes about to prove the Minor thus. *Ministers onely are called his Embassadors, Stewards of his mysteries, and beseech in his stead*, &c. Answer, 1. I think that those mentioned *Act.* 8. 4,5. of whom *Philip* was then onely a Deacon, as many of the Antients hold, not onely *Apollos* but also *Aquila* and *Priscilla* Acts 18. 26. *Frumentius* that converted the *Indians*, and the captive maid that brought the *Iberians* to the faith, were Embassadours of Christ, and Stewards of his mysteries, and might beseech in his stead. 2. But were it granted that Ministers only are called Christs Embassadours, &c. how is it proved that they onely should represent Christs person in breaking the bread, delivering it to all, bidding them take, eate, &c. Doth the Embassage of Christ, dispensing of his mysteries, beseeching in his stead, &c. consist in breaking bread, delivering it, bidding take, eate, &c? If it do, then a non-preaching Minister who doth these things may yet be an Embassadour of Christ, and Stewa[illegible] his mysteries, then the breaking bread, &c. is a converting ordinance, [illegible] Mr. *Pryn* held, which Mr. *Gillespy* and Mr. *Rutherford* deny. For my part I think to be an *Embassadour of Christ, and to beseech in his stead*, 2 Cor. 5. 20. *to be a Steward of the mysteries of God*, 1 Cor. 4. 1. are all one as to preach the Gospel, and that the Assembly did misallege the text 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. as they have done the other, to prove that neither Sacrament may be dispensed by any but a Minister of the word lawfully ordained, Confession of faith chap. 27. sect. 4. For mysteries of God never signifie Sacraments in Scripture, but the Gospel, *Ephes.* 6. 19. *Rom.* 16. 25. *Chamier panstrat. Cath. tom.* 4. l. 1. c. 4. sect. 9. *in Scripturis* μυστήριον *usurpari pro ipso rei sacræ signo profectò impostura est.* But Mr. *B.* tells me. *It is a silly answer of Mr.* T. *that Sacraments are not called mysteries of God.* For the word *preached neither is not the mystery it self, but a revealing and exhibiting that mystery, and so are the Sacraments. The one revealeth them to the eare, and the other to the eye.* Answ. Sure if the answer be silly, the refutation is no better. For if the word preached be not the mystery it self, then neither is the Sacrament, much lesse the breaking the bread and delivering it, and so to be Steward of the mysteries of God is not to be breaker and deliverer of the

bread and wine in the Lords Supper. But however Mr. B. grants that though the word preached be not the mystery it self, yet it is the revealing and exhibiting of the mystery; and that the sense undoubted of 1 Cor. 4. 1. *Stewards of the mysteries of God*, is revealers of the mystery of God by preaching the word. But then saith Mr. B. *the Sacrament reveals the mystery of God to the eye.* I reply, Mr. B. saith so, but not one text of Scripture saith so: nor is it true. The mystery containes not only the thing done by Christ, but the end, use, reason of it: but this is perceivable onely by the understanding, and the Sacrament abstractively from the word declares it not, no not so much as a picture: and therefore the Sacramental actions of themselves are not revelations of the mystery of Christ, nor ever so called in Scripture: and therefore I conclude, that the text 1 Cor. 4. 1. doth not prove that it is the peculiar office of an ordained Presbyter to Minister the Lords Supper by breaking bread, delivering it to all, bidding take, eat, &c. And though the title of Minister of the Gospel be used in the New Testament, yet the title of Minister of the Sacraments is a made title. 2. Saith Mr. B. *If there be no command or example in Scripture of any but Ministers administring the Lords Supper, then no other may do it; But there is no command or example in Scripture of any other doing it; they that say there is, let them shew it.* Answ. I find this command, 1 Cor. 11. 28. *But a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.* and this example 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one body and one bread: for we are all partakers of that one bread.* But for command or example that an ordained Presbyter onely should administer the Lords Supper by breaking bread, &c. let them that say there is, shew it. Mr. B. goes on, *But by this time you may see whither Mr. T. would reduce the Ministerial office, 1. Others may baptize. 2. And administer the Lords Supper. 3. And then preaching is all or almost all that is left (for he gives them farre lesse in government than I do.) And how well he defended the Ministerial privilege of publique preaching in his disputes with Captain Bray is too well known. And what need the people allow so much of their wealth to maintain Ministers? is not this next to the utter extirpation of them according to the doctrine of their learned Martin-Marprelate.* Answ. Pastors and Teachers or Presbyters to teach and govern the Church of God I am assured are a Divine institution, and a very merciful gift of Christ, *Ephes.* 4. 11, 12, 13. 1 Cor. 12.

28. *Acts* 14.23. 1 *Tim.* 3.1. *Tit.* 2.5. to whom people should yield obedience, *Heb.* 13.17. and yield maintenance liberally, 1 *Cor.* 9.14. *Gal.* 6.6. 1 *Tim.* 5.17,18. If any go about to extirpate them let him be accursed as an enemy to Christ and his Church. The railing bookes of *Martin-Marprelate*, and such like on the one side, and the slanderous bookes of Mr. *Edwards*, Mr. *Bastler*, &c. on the other side I abhorre. Yet I fear more danger to the Ministry by the pragmaticalnesse of the Ministers, especially their meddling with State matters, then either by *Martin-Marprelate* libels, or my assertions. Would Ministers keep to their studies and the work of Christ in preaching in season and out of season, it would be an establish their maintenance and Ministry, then the asserting such a juridical government and power of dispensing the seales (as they are called) as they do. I ascribe as much to the Ministry as the Scripture gives them. Though the office of preaching whether publique or private be proper to the Minister so as to be his constant imployment, and he ought not to be hindred in it, nay he is to be accountable to God for it: yet publique or private preaching I do not annex to ordained Presbyters as a peculiar priviledge to them, so as none else may be said to be sent or called of God to preach in Scripture sense but they. Notwithstanding what Mr. *Thomas Hall* in his *Pulpit guarded, or my quondam* scholar and worthy friend Mr. *Giles Wrinkeum*, in his better temper'd booke intitled *Private men no pulpit men*, have said, I still conceive that not onely for trial of expectants, but also upon other occasions persons not ordained may be permitted, yea desired to preach in the pulpits. I find these words in *Bilson Difference between Christian subjection and unchristian rebellion*, part. 4. *Strangers also if they were in place were suffered both to teach and baptize in the Church, as well as others that were tied to their cures, by reason that many were sent by the Apostles and by the Holy Ghost to visite the Churches and comfort the Christians in their tribulations, and such were according to their knowledge and gift not onely permitted, but also required to exhort the people, and to give thanks to God in other mens charges, Chrys. comm. in Mat. 4. 23. Manifestum est quod aliquando in Ecclesia Christianorum omnes fere Episcopos ex Scriptura in Scripturas rudes non prohibentes aut damnantes aut de hoc accusandos, Vide Basilium qui Origenis [illegible] Hieronymus, [illegible] Epiphanius, [illegible] Theodoretus, [illegible] Augustinus, [illegible] Ambrosius, [illegible] Hilarius, [illegible] Tertullianus, [illegible] Ignatius, [illegible] Dionysius, [illegible] Clemens, [illegible] Justinus, [illegible] Irenaeus, [illegible] Cyprianus, [illegible] Hippolytus, [illegible] Eusebius, [illegible] Socrates, [illegible] Sozomenus, [illegible] Theodoretus, [illegible] Gelasius, [illegible] Nicephorus, [illegible] Photius, [illegible] Zonaras, [illegible] Balsamon, [illegible] Oecumenius, [illegible] Theophylactus, [illegible] Euthymius, [illegible] Aretas, [illegible] Suidas, [illegible] Hesychius, [illegible] Lexicon, [illegible] Glossarium* 1 Cor. 14.19. Nevertheless I am against the counsels of many Souldiers and others, who against the denial of able teachers to whom the teaching of the people is committed, love to get into the pulpits of the [illegible]

ablishment to vent their peculiar conceits, and oftentimes their pernicious errors, not regarding to preach to the ignorant the clear truths of faith and a holy life in places where they have no Preacher, but to new convert to pervert them, and withdraw them from their able Teachers, and to disquiet them and their congregations by frivolous exceptions. And for this reason I was unwilling Captain *Fray* should preach at *Bewdley* when I was there, and when he would preach and bent himself to assert a liberty to all that had Gods sanctifying spirit, and could expresse their minds, to take upon them to teach publiquely what's the meaning of the Scripture, and what doctrines are true and what false, without any skill in arts, yea though he taught error, I did oppose him. Which if it were not so skilfully and happily done as Mr. *B.* better acquainted with such meas way might have done, yet me thinks my good will might have been accepted. But I see very little I do is well taken, and therefore see it necessary to wait patiently on God till my words and actions though intended for the furthering of reformation and good of the Ministry, in my *Examen* part. 2. sect. 7. in my *Apology* and elsewhere, be better relented and considered.

The fourth and fifth error Mr. *B.* chargeth me with as dangerous, and the *root of my error about baptism*, will more fitly come into the body of the dispute, in which I doubt not but I shall shew that both himself and Mr. *Blake* (however he esteem his writings) do recede from the Scripture and other approved authors in their making the New Covenant common to elect and reprobates, in making reprobates interest in the Covenant a fruit of Christs death, denying the absolute promise to be most fitly called the Covenant of Grace, hold that a person may not be baptized that is not known to belong to the Covenant of Grace, that God actually seals the Covenant of Grace to reprobates, with sundry other mistakes about Sacraments in general, as if their essence were in being seals of the Covenant of Grace, and deriving thence a right to baptism for believers Infants, though the Covenant be conditional and common to all.

The fifth error of mine he confutes is about the *Magistrates not being an officer of Christ as Mediator*. And he excepts against me for saying in pulpit at *Kewdley it was of dangerous consequence* which he held, though he named not me at any time, and he wrote to me, and I would not dispute it with him. To which I answer, It is true, preaching on *Matt.* 28. 18. the argument leading me to it, I did oppose that doctrine, that the *Magistrate is an officer of Christ the Mediator*, and because Mr. *B.* book was in some of my Auditors hands, did reade the passage in his Aphorisms page 173. and said it was of dangerous consequence. And indeed

indeed I think it so still. For I think it will follow, that except a Magistrate can shew his commission from Christ, that he is an usurper, and then none is bound to him but to suppresse him, then no infidel is a lawfull Magistrate who denies Christ, and it will be questionable whether this will not extend to a non-churchmember or an excommunicate person, then a Magistrates doing of right to an infidel against a believer, or to one believer against another, as putting him to death, is an act for Christ as Mediator, and if because all power is given to him in heaven and in earth therefore magistracy, so as that all power must be derived from Christ as Mediator, then a Fathers power over his child, but sure that is in a Father by nature, nor do I think it any part of the curse; then ruling Presbyters should do the acts of civil Magistrates as having plain title to rule under Christ. Nor do I think Mr. *B.* hath answered these arguments or the rest, but that however he proves Magistracy to be from Christs appointment, and to be subordinate to his laws, and accountable to him, and ought to act for him, yet not that the commission of every lawful Magistrate is from him as Mediator. I think it will follow if Mr. *Bs.* position be true, that supposing Christ had not been Mediator, there had been no lawfull Magistrate, and that *Dominium fundatur in gratia*, which was heretofore denied. And seth Christ is heir of all things, and believers onely are Christs, and all theirs, 1 *Cor.* 3, 22, 23. it would be considered whether by parity of reason the Saints might not intitle themselves to all power, and all mens estates, which was charged on Anabaptists at *Munster*. But I find I digresse, and therefore stop till more liberty draw me to a fuller handling of it.

Sect. XX.

Many learned men (with the Oxford Convocation) of former and later times take Infant-baptisme onely for an unwritten tradition.

MR. *B.* proceeds to answer my Antidote, termes it a *Corrective for a circumforaneous Antidote*: but the Antidote will appear to be good if taken, notwithstanding his disgraceful term of *Corrective* without vertue. Page 199. He prints two passages of Dr. *Whitaker* for the late *Oxford Convocation* to reade, and referres to the like in *Drawsius*. But whatever Doctor *Whitaker* thought, yet that the Antients did take Baptisme of Infants to have been an Apostolical tradition unwritten seemes to me

not from that which is said in my *Examen* part. 1. sect. 5. not avoided by Mr. *Ms. Defence*. In the *Council of Basil* in the oration of the *Cardinal of Ragusi* it is asserted, *Item nusquam legitur in canone Scripturæ S. quod parvulus recenter baptizatus, qui nec corde credit ad justitiam, nec ore confitetur ad salutem, inter fideles & credentes computetur. Et nihilominus Ecclesia ita determinavit et statuit, &c.* And, *in principio hujus Sacramenti baptizabantur solum illi qui per se sciebant fidem interroganti respondere.* To which purpose *Walafridus Strabo* many hundred years before, and *Vives* about that time, whose words are alleged in my *Exercitation*, the title page and sect 17. *Erasmus resp. Archiep. Hispal. ad artic. object. 61. Sunt et alia innumera quæ prisci non ausi sunt definire, sed suspensa pronunciatione venerabantur, quod genus est an parvuli essent baptizandi.* And commonly the learnedst Papists do instance in Infant-baptism as an unwritten tradition in force; and whereas it is objected that *Bellarm.* and others do bring Scripture for it, *Becan. manual.* lib. 1. c. 2. sect. 24. answers, *aliqua possunt probari ex Scriptura quando constat de vero & legitimo Scripturæ sensu.* So he *saith it is concerning Infant-baptism, which is proved from* John 3. 5. *but that the sense whereby to prove it is onely manifest by tradition.* Which is confirmed in the Canon law and Schoolmen, an Infants-baptism was not reckoned perfect, till the Bishop laid on hands, which act was called Confirmation, to wit, of the imperfect Baptism in infancy. *Molinæus* in his *Vates l. 2. c. 7.* cites the *canon dist. 5. de consecratione, as determining that without the Sacrament of Confirmation no man is a full Christian. Can. omnes, et Can. ut jejuni. Thomas 3. parte summæ, q. 72. art. 9. dicit hoc sacramentum esse perfectionem Baptismi: innuens Baptismum esse imperfectum nisi accesserit Confirmatio. Lumb. l. 4. sent. dist. 7. A. omnes fideles per manus impositionem Episcoporum post Baptismum accipere debent in Confirmatione Spiritum sanctum ut plenè Christiani inveniantur. Bellarm. tom. 3. de sacr. confirm. c. 12. confirmatio est complementum & perfectio baptismi. Lib. 2. de effec. Sacram. c. 8. est Confirmatio quædam perfectio & consummatio Baptismi. Jewel Defence of the Apolog.* page 218. allegeth it as *Caietan* tenet, that *an Infant, for that he wanteth instruction in faith, therefore hath not perfect Baptism.* Consonant hereto is the conceit of the common people, that they have not their full Christendome till they be Bishopped. But that it may appear even learned Protestants speak near the same, I will cite some of their speeches; Among which I will forbear to recite the speeches of the Lord *Brook* and Mr. *Daniel Rogers* alleged by me

ni

in my *Exercit.* sect. 18. and cleared in my *Apology* from Mr. *Rogers* his latter glosse, nor the opinion of Mr. *Redford*, who judged with the Romanists, *that the Scripture gives us proof onely of the reasonableness of Infants baptisme*, as I gather by Mr. *Bs.* answer to him page 205. Dr. *Field of the Church fourth book chap.* 20. *The fourth kind of tradition is the continued practise of such things as are neither contained in the Scripture expressely, nor the examples of such practise expressely there delivered, though the grounds, reasons, and causes of the necessity of such practise be there contained, and the benefit or good that followeth it. Of this sort is the Baptisme of Infants, which is therefore named a tradition, because it is not expressely delivered in Scripture that the Apostles did baptize Infants, nor any expresse precept there found that they should so do. Yet is not this so received by bare and naked tradition, but that we find the Scripture to deliver unto us the grounds of it.* Doctor *Prideaux fasci. Controv. Theol. loc.* 4. *sect.* 3. *q.* 2. *Pædobaptisme rests on no other Divine right then Episcopacy.* Doctor Jeremy Taylor *in his Liberty of prophesying sect.* 18. *num.* 34. *after he had ventilated the point on both sides saies, there is much more truth then evidence on our sides*, meaning Pædobaptists. To all which I will adde the words of *Theophilus Philadelphus de quadriformi*, that is Mr. *Young*, as I am informed, an eminent man in the late Assembly, and Mr. *Marshals* friend that help him in the first part of his *Defence*, in his *Dies Dominica* lib. 1. c. 10. page 54. where he confesseth ingenuously thus. *Anabaptistas Pædobaptismo obstantes apertis testimoniis ferire non possumus, nec sumus hoc tale commentum ex parallela præcepti de Circumcisione sumere, ut ad Apostolica: quæ quum aliquando fuit obscurior, auxilio nihilominus Ecclesiæ primævis & historicis temporibus adjicimus: ita licet præfractos Anabaptistas non movebunt; apud prudentes, morigeros, & Agnos rerum æstimatores valebunt.* So that according to him, the main weight lies on the custome of the Church, which is falsely imagined to have been from the Apostles, as in some measure is proved in my *Examen* part the first, not yet shaken by Mr. *Mr. friend* with all his insight in Antiquity. From which I inferre, that the Ancients and learned afore *Zuinglius* did account Infants-baptisme to have been an unwritten tradition, having reason from Scripture, not evident of it self, but to be received for the determination of the Church, and that because it was not fully perfected, therefore Confirmation was added, which was retained in the English Liturgy as necessarily previous to the Lords Supper, not do many of the best learned Protestants speak much otherwise out of the heat of dispute against Anabaptists. They

are farre from Mr. *B.* audaciousnesse to assert it as having *plain Scripture proof for it.* The very hesitant resolution of the most learned and considerate is enough to represse his vain attempt, and to awaken those that depend on his proofes, and rest on their Infant-sprinkling, and neglect the practise of being baptized after profession of faith, being so expressely enjoyned in Scripture as a prime important duty for their salvation.

SECT. XXI.

Many things are cleered about my conformity, Anabaptists necessity to be baptized, the manner of dipping used by them, their standing to their confession of faith, &c.

Page 241. he saith, *I begin with a complaint of my sufferings*, whereas my words were a gratulation for the change of my condition, and for my sad complaints Mr *B.* makes them more then they were, and misrepresents me in the time and reason of them. I let passe his jerkes *about my health, and my grievance of removing from* Bewdley, *his way to heaven and mine.* Mr. *B.* page 242 would vindicate his passages I cite in the Epistle to the people of *Bewdley*: but he passeth over that which goeth before in my Epistle, and makes no answer to any of these three things, 1. That he assignes no sufficient note whereby to discerne the visible Church-membership of Infants of which he speaks. 2. That there is no connexion between his visible Church-membership of Infants and the initial seal, without institution of the rite to be so used. 3. that in the positive rites of the New Testament, there's no reason to be a rule to us, but the appointers will in some precept or practise. And to shew the precept to be against him his own words are alleged and that rightly, however he interpret or interlace them. His interpretation agrees not with his own passage *Appendix* page 56. which saith, *neither are the seals usefull till the accepting and entring of the Covenant*, where he placeth accepting before entering the Covenant, and in both his passages speakes of accepting and entering with consent, which Infants cannot do, page 243. he saith, *I seem to speak as if I had some of my old Episcopal ceremonious spirit, though he hoped and believed verily that I did not turn meerly to the times, though with the times.* To which I answer. Mr. *B.* was a stranger to me till a little afore these times, and therefore is not fit to charge me

with

with an Episcopal ceremonious spirit. Were it worth while to trouble the world with it, I could shew how I examined, as well as at those years, I could the points in difference about which I was to subscribe and conforme, and however I was carried away with the stream, yet my subscription was according to Doctor *Burges* his explication, and my conformity upon Mr. *Sprints* grounds, I was no promoter of either, and in the worst time I think none can say but I stuck fast to the main, the propagating the Gospel and Conjunction with the Godly. And my oppoſing the Bishops began with the ſooneſt afore this Parliament began, as ſoon as ever I deprehended the Biſhops to be wholly for their own rule, and adverſaries to the preaching of the Goſpel. And for my non-conformity, reaſons were given with ſome of the firſt in a Sermon at a viſitation at *Lemſter*, *November* 24. 1641 ſince printed. And what I ſaid the ceremonies were more excuſable then Pædobaptiſm is true, 1. They were not at firſt urged otherwiſe then as indifferent things, Pædobaptiſm is urged as of Divine appointment, and yet the chief principle of non-conformiſts doth more ſtrongly plead againſt it then the ceremonies. 2. Pædobaptiſm not withſtanding the palliating ſalves of Mr. *M.* Mr. *B.* I find farre more pernicious then the ceremonies; it being, 1. The great occaſion of the ſoul-deſtroying preſumption whereby a great part of men periſh, and the genuine hinderance of the reformation of the Lords Supper and Church-communion. 2. it quite perverts the end and uſe of baptiſm, which the ceremonies did onely in ſome ſort diſorder. I juſtifie not the ceremonies, and therefore I need not anſwer the men he names, but their writings yield ſtrong arguments for me againſt Pædobaptiſm, and better for me then for themſelves. Mr. *Bs.* queſtions page. 243. are upon a miſtake, as if I counted all Pedobaptiſts meer formal teachers: whereas what I ſpeak was in tendemeſſe to *Bewdley*, leſt they out of averſeneſs to my doctrine ſhould reſt in a meer formal teacher, which I had reaſon to fear was the aime of ſome, whom perhaps Mr. *B.* may find (though I wiſh he may not) he hath miſtaken for godly men. Who perhaps might tell him what was not true, *that the power of godlineſs is much diminiſhed ſince my comming to them, and their profitable converſe turned into heart-burnings, jealouſies and fruitleſſe contendings.* His argument pag. 244. is vain: for were it ſuppoſed that *Infants of believers were Church-members* (which his whole book proves not) and it were true that *baptizers cannot otherwiſe have knowledge when thoſe that are piouſly educated begin to be Church-members*, yet the practiſe of baptizing the children of Chriſtians ordinarily at years of diſcretion overturnes not the true end of Baptiſm. For whe-

ther the true (to which he addes *principal* in a *parenthesis*, as if true and principal were all one) end of Baptism be to be Christs sign for solemn admission of Church-members or Disciples, or to be an engaging seal as elsewhere; yet both these ends are preserved if they be baptized many years after their being Disciples. It is untrue, *that it is my usual artifice to work on the affections of people when I mistrust my strength to work on mens understandings*; it may be more truly said of himself, who usually fills up the vacuity of proofs with childish exclamations, admirations, &c. What I said and preached from *Acts* 8. 23. is right, people do indanger *their being cut off from Gods people*, who disobey Christ in not being baptized when their duty is told them, as the *Pharisees and Lawyers rejected or made void the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of* John *Luke* 7. 30. I preach against popish necessity of Baptism, and yet hold a necessity of precept for believers to be baptized, yea and an ordinary necessity of means according to Christs doctrine, *Marke* 16. 16. I threaten no man for not yielding to my opinion, but not yielding to a plain command of Christ, *Mat.* 28. 19. and his Apostle, *Act.* 2. 38. &c. acknowledged by all my Antagonists (except Socinianized) from which Mr. *B.* observations concerning the backsliding of some cannot acquit him. Were my words of any weight with him, I should advise him, more seriously to consider whether this his writing be *not a perverting the right wayes of the Lord*. Page 145. that Mr. *B.* did not at *least mainly direct the passage of his Epistle against me*, he will hardly believe that takes notice of the passage, the time when, the texts produced, the accusation it self, the naming me, yea or his own words so often in his book, as page 167. *that he used the speeches to preserve his friends from the danger of my error, that being a dying man he might have no opportunity after to warne his people, that a fire being at* Bewdley *he had reason to provide for* Kederminster. And what though it were intended against all that take my course, yet it might be *directed mainly against me*, whom he singled out for commendation, but yet in such a manner, as I may say with *King James in his answer to Cardinal Perons oration, I defie the prayses* that ascribe *ability and moderation to me*, and charge me not only with *grosse absurdities, but also with little tender conscientious scrupulous erring, playing the Devils part*, besides other imputations, which if not directed against me solely, yet he might have conceived would be taken as chargeable upon me with others. By officiating Priest I meant not any other then meer reading Ministers, by whom most were baptized, and it was not *scornfully* used by me, nor like *the language of Martin-Marprist*

(which I abhorre) but to insinuate that in that respect, as well as the manner of sprinkling and defect of profession of faith, the Anabaptists so called had reason not to content themselves with Infant-baptism. It is true, our English prelatical Divines do account Baptism sufficiently administred that is so done, yea though it were by a popish Priest or a Midwife, and I think Presbyterians and Independents do agree with them: for they do not question their Baptism, nor seek any other, though it's likely many have been so baptized. Yet I find *Spondanus* in his *Auctar. Chronol. ad annum* 1604. reporting that in *France*, at *Vapincum* in the *Dauphinate*, a Synod wherein famous *Chamier* was President, determined according to a former *Synod* at *Poitiers*, *that Baptism administered by expectants of ordination was of no value, and to be iterated by Ministers themselves.* Whether this relation be true or not, yet my end in my expression being to give reason why Anabaptists content not themselves with their pretended Infant-baptism, Mr. *B.* doth ill to interpret my words as *scornfull*. I do now professe as I did not long since at *Coventrey* to Mr. *William Swayn* (who I perceived since upon his misconstruction hath also alleged this passage in the end of Mr. *Stephens* book intitled *a precept for Baptism of Infants out of the New Testament*,) that I do reverence many Pædobaptists as godly Ministers of the Gospel farre beyond my self. Yet still I say, that they most injuriously inveigh against Anabaptists for being baptized at years of discretion, and thereby necessitate them to associate themselves, when the Baptism of Infants is confessed by the most considerate not to have cleer proof without help of Tradition unwritten; which yet learned men contradict, the sprinkling they have received is not Baptism, nor appointed by Christ, nor the person administring it to many Infants a Preacher of the Gospel, and many learned men have made Baptisme of Infants imperfect without Confirmation, and Churches have thought it necessary to retain it, yea Mr. *B.* would have something like it (which but for the dipping in cold water is to the same purpose as rebaptizing) page 119. 120. which to me discovers the imperfection and insufficiency of Infant-baptism to its end; and though Mr. *B.* in answer to Mr. *Bedford* holding *baptizing but once onely a tradition unwritten*, undertakes *to prove it fully from Scripture* page 305. (whose performances I find very short of his undertakings) yet *Theophilus Philokyriaces* in the book forenamed page 54. sayes, *Sacrum baptismum non repetendum semper statuit Ecclesia: de qua tamen interdicto in sacris tabulis nihil occurrit*, and therefore unless I will speak against my conscience I must needs say that it is ignorance or wilfulness holds Ministers and people in their stiffe asserting and practise

of Infant-baptism, and the violent opposition they make to their practise who are baptized or baptize believers upon so great reason. He tells me it is *an untruth that he* said [*dipping in cold water is murther and adultery*] about which I not contend, whether he used those very termes onely, but so farre as my memory retaines, and the notes I could get relate, those words were used by him without addition of [*the ordinary practise*] or [*naked*.] But my meaning in my denial of his speech, was to justifie dipping as used by those termed Anabaptists, whose baptizing so farre as I have known it, hath been seemly with coverings fit to be quickly put off when they come out of the water, and with meet provision for the health of persons, not tying persons to cold water in the open aire or any other inconvenient thing to health and modesty, but onely requiring the person to be under water resembling Christs burial and resurrection according to *Rom.* 6.3,4. *Col.* 2.12. as the stream of the expositors do conceive the allusion. And therefore I cannot be of opinion that *the ordinary practise of baptizing by dipping the whole body in cold or warme water openly or privately is either a breach of the sixth or seventh Commandment*, unless he condemne Christ and his Apostles as appointing and practising a sin contrary to Gods commands, and be of an opinion, which is refuted by frequent experience of aged weak persons men and women baptized in cold stormy times in the open aire in cold running water without detriment to their health to mine one knowledge. Nevertheless were it that any person did conceive, that he ought to be baptized *naked, as vossius Thes. Theol.* and *Hist. disp.* 1. *de baptismo th. 6.* 7. 8. shewes in the first ages men women and Infants were, yet he may find there how provision was made against immodesty and murder, & I wonder that either Mr. *B.* or any other considerate man that knows how persons go into bathes frequently, should imagine so evil of a persons going into the water but once in course habit in a penitent form not without grave company, not staying a minute in the water, that it could not be performed without such danger as Mr. *B.* would possesse people with, in the second part of his book chap. 12. 13. His satyrical I had almost said scurrilous quips I let passe. I did not charge Mr. *B.* with endeavours *to drive me or others out of the land, or destroy us*, but I think the instigators to the ordinance against Heresies, have had such minds. And whereas he saith page 247. *I tell him of his danger* and elsewhere that *I threaten him*, is a suggestion that I cannot yet ghesse whence it should arise. The citation out of his book sect. 3. of my Antidote was to shew Mr. *B.* paraphrased *Mat.* 28. 19, to like purpose as I do. That the untruths he

charged,

chargeth me with page 248. 252. were not such is shewed before. The matter of the fourth, fift, sixt, and seventh sections being argumentative, is to be referred to the first part of his book. Page 257. Mr. *B.* applies that to one term of calling some Sects which I said of the rest of his discourse, especially *the accusation of societies proving wicked*, that it hath a manifest tincture of reviling. He chargeth my *conscience as having a flaw for insinuating that he called all Independents a Sect, and that for denying the power of a Synod to excommunicate, whereas he plainly limited his speech to that Independency which gives the people to govern by vote, which is the same with separatism.* To which I reply, I took it, and do still, that in the books of Independents it is their received tenet, that excommunicating however it be not without officers, yet is in the people, from *Mat.* 18. 17. but that whence they are named Independents by Mr. *Herle* and others, is from denying superiority of Synods in governing, and appeales to them, and if a Sect then from thence as their distinguishing tenet. However for the tenet *of the peoples governing by voice*, I know no reason why they should be called a Sect rather then their opposites. The excommunication which the Scripture speaks of so farre as I discern, is no where made a part of government, or of the Elders office any more then the Peoples. In antiquity it's apparant out of *Cyprian*, &c. that the people had a great hand in Elections, Excommunications, Absolutions. Nor is a person a Separatist for that tenet, but for dividing practises: other things in that section are answered before. To that page 259. of my logick, I say he is mistaken in it. I know this water to be cold because I feel its coldnesse, this person to be a false teacher because I hear from him false doctrine. The subject is not the *suppositum* as a substance but as a substance with its adjunct. I prove not a wall to be a wall by its whitenesse seen, but a white wall, and this is not *idem per idem*. The Apostle shews the evil lives of Hereticks for better prevention of their practises, not to prove them Hereticks [*A ravening wolfe*] signifies neither error of doctrine, nor viciousnesse of life, but the effect or end of the persons described, to wit, destroying souls, often also lives and estates. That the *false Prophets have sheepes clothing*, that is, fair shews, though *inwardly are ravening wolves*, overthrows Mr. *B.* interpretation he pleades so much for, except he think they can have *sheeps clothing*, that is fair shewes of a good life, who are openly wicked, so as *by the fruits of their wickednes* they may be known, which me thinks comes near a contradiction. Mr. *B.* often sayes, he *takes me not to be an Heretick nor a meer Anabaptist except they divide the Church*. But he taking me

for

for a divider of the Church, for my error must of necessity take me for an Heretick if he stand to the descriptions he there laith he likes, so that I cannot nor any Anabaptist or Independent long look to be out of his black roll of Hereticks. Page 260. Mr. *B.* laith, *I make his question an affirmation*, and so doth he himself that tells us it speaks *what a rarity it is according to his reading that any society of Anabaptists hath not proved wicked.* But I make it *a peremptory determination, wherein it is neither omnino dubitantis, nor yet determinantis, but provocantis.* Nor did I say it was a most peremptory determination, but, *no man will I think take his interrogation for any other then a most peremptory determination*, which I think is true, the words carrying a plain shew of a peremptory determination, and being written to the people of *Kederminster* were not likely to be a provocation of Anabaptists to look over their own intelligence, but a resolute assurance, that there hath not been known a society of Anabaptists since the world first knew them, that proved not wicked. And therefore I put no false sense on his words, as he falsely chargeth me, nor do I as he saith, *call him dog*, I only say, like a right English mastive he flies in the face, &c. not comparing him to a dog, but his bold act to the manner of English mastives boldness, which he is no more called dog, then Christ is thief, when he tells, I come as a thief, *Revel.* 3. 3. To that which he saith page 262. *of mystery*, I have answered. To his question, *Did no body contradict Infant-baptism for so many hundred years? and yet is it an innovation.* I answer yes: and I think Mr. *B.* will say of keeping an *Easter*, *Lent-fast*, Infant-communion, Monkish profession, Episcopacy, at least some of these are innovations not contradicted for so many hundred years. For his testimonies page 262, 263, 264. for the antiquity of Infant-baptism, to the chiefest of them answer hath been made, that the eldest of them is not till the third age, that they only urge it and practise it in case of evident danger of present death to save from perishing; that the conceit of peculiar privilege to Infants of believers is a late innovation: some of them are meerly impertinent without Mr. *B.* vain inference, some Heathenish rites of expiating Infants are unseeming Mr. *B.* to allege, they being from Satan. My testimonies page 264. of *Bernard*, *Petrus Clunia-censis*, *Eckbertus*, are vindicated before, *Strabo* doth not say *that after Austins time, Infant-baptism was not*, but only *in the first times*; not is it likely that he did mistake *Austins* age 10 years. That the Copies put 25. for 35. Nor do I think he was mistaken in the reason of *Austins* deferring his Baptism, but that the reason he gives was one though not the

sole

sole reason of it, and the testimony of *Walafridus Strabo* though later then *Augustine*, yet he giving himself to search out and to write of antient rites, is of more credit concerning the Antiquity of Infant-baptism then *Augustine*, who as I shew *Apology*. sect. 6. and elsewhere, did often inconsiderately call that an Apostolical tradition, which was commonly observed in his dayes within the compass of his acquaintance. *Cyprians* speech if it be rightly brought by Mr. *B.* will prove all still-born Infants to be lost, being not of the visible Church Catholick. That which Mr. *B.* page 266. saith, *fully satisfies him*, part of it is false, the rest so frivolous, that I can impute his satisfaction to no other cause then his inconsiderateness. The very same or like plea will serve for communion of young children in which yet Mr. *B.* is not satisfied. But to me it is very good satisfaction that baptizing of Infants is but an innovation, neither agreeing with the institution of Christ, nor the Apostles practise, nor known till it began to be conceived necessary to give grace and to save from perishing, yet then disswaded and not practised but in case of imminent danger of death, nor maintained on any other ground till *Zuinglius* his dayes. What the Churches of Anabaptists so called have done *in London* that Mr. *B.* should so much *lament*, till I know what it is I take to be a Calumny. That Anabaptists have been in danger by the instigations of Preachers and writers it is a marvel to me, that Mr. *B.* should not understand, who can hardly be ignorant whence the ordinance against blasphemies and heresies came. That any *of my Antagonists are turned out of house and home is unknown to me*, surely not for non-conformity to rebaptizing, most certain, that if any such thing hath been done it was never by my procurement, nor I think any of the Churches of Anabaptists. That which Mr. *B.* page 267. saies, that the *same men that subscribe the Anabaptists confession have many of them written other kind of doctrine elsewhere.* I doubt whether it be true, I find him onely naming *Paul Hobson* page 147. and citing some passages of his, of which that which is most liable to exception Mr. *B.* himself gives us this excuse in his *Saints everlasting rest* part 2. chap. 1. sect. 2. page 169. *not understanding that they affirm and deny the same thing in several expressions*: so that however his expressions be dangerous, yet it is probable he held not the *Socinian* opinion, which he contradicted in the subscription to the confession, but onely discovered his weakness. And yet Mr. *B.* I think is not ignorant that so holy & learned a man as M. *Pemble* near the beginning of his *Vindiciæ gratiæ* hath a like conceit of *Gods never hating the elect, but being reconciled from eternity*, taking reconciliation for an imma-

near

nent act in God: which as I imagine Mr. *B.* would excuse in Mr. *Pemble*, so might he with a like charity excuse the other in *Paul Hobson*. What he cites out of *Cyprian* I wish Mr. *B.* had Englished it, and that both Anabaptists and their opposites would learn it. Page 268. he saith if my book of *Scandals were read, men may perhaps receive a preservative from my own hand from the danger of my opinion*, to which I say, I wish my book of *Scandals* were more read, nor do I fear that my doctrine will be the lesse embraced for reading it, if my interpretation of my own words justified even by Mr. *B.* be received, as I shew before. Page 269. he tells us *the Levellers were Anabaptists*, but I cannot yet learn of any of them he names except *Den* that was so: though I deny not but there might be sundry of them such, likely of the Free-willers disclaimed by the seven Churches in *London*, and that they were but few in comparison of the rest: by the Newes-books I gather the Levelling businesse was carried on by such as were in no gathered Church, but lived above ordinances. As for Mr. *Bs.* dark criminations I can give no answer to them, unlesse I could plow with his heifer and find out his riddle: But my hope is those great instruments of God to break the enemies of those that are termed Sectaries, though Mr. *Bs.* words seem to forebode and misdeem evil of them, will and do prove better then he discribes them, though I imagine they be not Anabaptists. Nor do I like Mr. *Bs.* obscure lyrical criminations, they having some shew of a malevolent mind. Whatever Mr. *B.* may conceive of the danger of the Anabaptists way in other things, I am sure if they would keep themselves onely to this to be baptized upon profession of faith, they should be in a safe way, even in the way of Christ.

Sect. XXII.

The speech [that no one Country is gathered into Christs visible Church] contains no malignancy to Christ, but is a manifest truth.

MOst of that which is in Mr. *Bs.* answer to the last section of my *Apologie* hath either been replied to before or in some other part of my writings, or will fall into the main of the dispute, wherein I doubt not but I shall fully vindicate my argument against the visible Church-membership of Infants, from the different cause of the Jewish and Christian Church.

Church, though the thing be so manifest, to wit, that the Christian Church was otherwise gathered then the Jewish, that I see nothing but meer wrangling in the questions Mr. *B.* propounds. And to his words page 279, 280. *Sir, if you were my Father, I would tell you that when you say, Christ makes no one City, Countrey, Tribe, his Disciples, you speak most malignantly, and wickedly against the Kingdome and dignity of my Lord Jesus.* I answer, I meet so often with Mr. *Bs.* high charges, upon palpable mistakes and weak proofs, that I fear his misguided zeal or natural distemper hath brought him to an habit of ill-speaking. My words were not as Mr. *B.* sets them down, but thus [*no one Country, or City, or Tribe together, were gathered by the Apostles or other Preachers into the Christian visible Church, but so many of all as the Lord vouchsafed to call by his word and spirit*] which hath neither wickedness nor malignancy against the Kingdome and dignity of the Lord Jesus; but a manifest truth expressely taught in the Holy Scripture as congruous to the glory of God and the Lord Jesus, 1 *Cor.* 1. 26, 27. 28, 29. *Not many wise men, &c. Ergo* not the whole Nation, *Revel.* 5. 9. *out of every Nation, Ergo* not the whole Nation, as he did the Jewes in the Wildernesse. The relations in the Gospel and Acts of the Apostles plainly prove it true, that by *John Baptist*, Christ, the 12. and 70. Disciples was no entire Nation, City, Countrey or Tribe gathered into the visible Church-christian, but parts of them, and those fewer then the adversaries, who in every place were so numerous (when the Christians are counted at some few thousands) as that even at Jerusalem and elsewhere they prevailed to disperse Christians by persecution. Nor do Mr. *Bs.* questions prove, *that into the Christian visible Church any one whole Country, City or Tribe, young or old, men and women, are gathered by the Apostles and other Preachers*, as *Moses* did gather together the Jewish Nation, *Exod.* 19. *Deut.* 29. But saith Mr. *B.* 1. *Hath he not commanded to Disciple Nations?* I answer, yes: *to make Disciples of all Nations by Preaching the Gospel to every Creature*, as it is, *Mark* 16. 15. but no where by civil authority to gather a whole City, Countrey or Tribe, and to draw them into a National or City Covenant together, old and young, but to offer Christ and to baptize so many as are willing to embrace him. 2. Saith Mr. *B. Hath not the Father promised to give the Heathen or Nations for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession*, Psal. 2. *and that Nations shall serve him?* Answ. He hath, and it is fulfilled, but not in Mr. *Bs.* sense, as if one whole Nation, City, Countrey or Tribe were gathered together in the manner *Moses* brought

into Covenant all the Jewish Nation, but as the Apostle speaks *by ministring the Gospel*, Rom. 15. 16. the Gentiles, that is believers among them, are an *offering to God*, 3. *glorifie God, ver.* 9. *praise him, trust in him*, ver. 11, 12. So as it was foretold *in Abraham all Nations should be blessed*, which is expounded *Gal.* 3. 7, 8, 9. *Rom.* 4. 17, 18. believers of all other Nations as well as Jews. 3. *And that the Kingdoms of the world shall become the Kingdomes of the Lord and his Christ?* Ans. I reade those words *Rev.* 11. 15. but I find the time of fulfilling to be when the seventh Angel hath sounded, which some say is not till the world to come. So Mr. *Seager of the world to come*, part. 1. sect. 8. And this is not improbable from ver. 18. and *Revel.* 10. 6, 7. *The New Annot.* saith thus, *Antichrist is weakened, and Christ hath begun to take the Kingdome out of his hand, and shall have a visible Church like an Empire in all the known world, and that to the end, but that it is not yet.* 4. *And do you not see it fulfilled before your eyes? Are not* Bewdley, Kederminster, *&c. and* England (*till of late*) *as fully Christs Disciple, and so Church-members, as the Jews were in Covenant with God, and so Church-members?* Ans. If by [*it*] be meant the prophecies *Psal.* 2. 8. and 72. 11. I see them fulfilled, though not in Mr. *Bs.* sense: but the prophecie *Revel.* 11. 15. I see not yet fulfilled. I see at *Bewdley, Kederminster, in England*, people who generally are called Christians, but I do not see that all, old and young, are Disciples or Church-members, or ought to be so accounted, or that they were ever brought into such a Covenant as the Jews, or ought to be accounted Church-members by vertue of such a Covenant. There is not a word in my writings to that end. Mr. *B.* chargeth me [*that I would not have Princes and Masters do what* Abraham *and* Moses *did, in bringing the people of Israel into Covenant with God*] but I say, that should they do so, yet the Infants are not thereby to be accounted visible Church-members in a Christian Church. The commission to gather the Christian Church was not given to the Emperour, but Apostles. The Apostles, it is true, were sent to proselyte them that were no Church-members, and yet they were sent to proselyte, or in the phrase of Scripture to Disciple, the visible Church-members of the Jewish Church as well as the Gentiles. What I said, I still say, that the different Church-call of the Jewish and Christian Churches is enough to shew a different Church-state, and consequently the argument is not good from the Jewish Infants visible Church-membership to ours. If Mr. *Bs.* judgement be *not so commandable*, as to assent to what I say, it is no much the *lesse commendable*. The speech of Mr. *Herle*, and the jest of

Matthew

Matthiahs are misapplied. When he saith, *why may we not write plainly against one Anothers judgement by a loving consent?* He may know that it was my desire it should have been so, that it was not so, was from himself. He that believes he hath *shewed love* in this his writing, is very credulous. For the rest, if Mr. *B.* will have the patience and indifferency of judgement which is meet, he may see an answer to his allegations about Gods mercy to Infants, and the repeal of their visible Church-membership. If he remain in his opinion (which I much fear, knowing him so well as I do) and I in mine, we must leave our writings to others to judge, & especially to that *day which shall declare every mans work, being revealed in fire.* In the mean time (sleighting his vain curse, which is page 217.) my prayer for him as my self is, that we *may do nothing against the truth, but for the truth.*

FINIS.

Cyprian, *and the other Collegues which in the* Council *were present, to the number of 66. to brother* Fidus *greeting.*

MOst dear brother, *we have read thy letters, in which thou hast signified concerning one* Victor *a Presbyter, that* Therapius *our Collegue* in a time not ripe, and with over much hastе, hath granted him peace, before he had done full penance, and satisfied the Lord God, against whom he had offended. *Which thing hath enough moved us, that he hath departed from the authority of our Decree, that before the allowed and full time of satisfaction, and without the asking and privity of the common sort, no infirmity urging, nor necessity compelling, peace should be granted to him. But upon counsel weighed long with us, it was enough to chide* Therapius *our Collegue in that he rashly did this, and to have admonished him, that for hereafter he do no such thing. For we have not thought, that the peace however once granted by a Priest of God should be taken away; and for this cause we have permitted* Victor *to use the Communication granted to him. But for what belongeth to the* cause of Infants, whom thou hast said should not be baptized within the second or third day in which they were born, and that the law of antient Circumcision is to be considered, so as that *thou shouldest not think* him that is born should be baptized and hallowed within the 8. day, *it seem-*

bd farre otherwise to all in our Council. For unto this which thou thoughtest should be done, none of us have agreed, but all have rather judged that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none that are born of mankind. For when the Lord in his Gospel saith, The son of man came not to destroy mens souls, but to save them, as much as in us lies if it may be, no soul is to be lost. For what is wanting to him, who is once formed in the wombe by the hand of God? For to us and in our eyes they which are born do seem to receive growth according to the course of secular dayes: but what ever things are made by God are perfected by the Majesty and work of God the Maker. Lastly, the faith of Divine Scripture declares to us, that there is one evenness of the Divine gift to all, whether Infants or elder in age. When Heliseus upon the Infant son of the Shunamite widow which lay dead so laid himself when he prayed to God, that head was applied to head, & face to face, & the members of Heliseus spread over were joyned to each of the members of the little one, and the feet to its feet; Which thing if it be thought on according to the quality of our birth and body, an Infant cannot be equalled to a person grown and come to full stature, neither could he close and fit little members to greater: But their Divine and Spiritual evenness is expressed, that all men are even and equal when they are made by God, and our age may have difference in increase of bodies according to the world, not according to God: unless if the grace also which is given to the baptized be given lesse or more according to the age of receivers: whereas the holy Spirit is equally given to all, not by measure, but out of tenderness and fatherly indulgence. For God as he accepts not a person, so neither doth he accept of age, sith he affordes himself alike to all unto ballanced equality for the obtaining of heavenly Grace. And for whereas thou hast said the footstep of an Infant made in the first dayes of his birth is not clean, because every one of us as yet is afraid to kiss him, neither do we think this to be a hindrance to the giving of heavenly Grace: for it is written, all things are clean to the clean; neither ought any one to be afraid to do that which God hath vouchsafed. For although the Infant is yet new from the birth, yet it is not so that one in giving grace and granting peace ought to be afraid to kiss him, sith in the kiss of an Infant every one of us according to his religion ought to think of the very hands of God as yet fresh, which we in some sort kiss in man now formed and newly born, when we embrace that which God hath made. For as for what was observed in Jewish carnal Circumcision the 8. day, it was a Sacrament foregoing in a shadow and in an image, but is now compleat

in

in the truth, Christ being come. For because the day in which the Lord should rise and quicken and give us Spiritual Circumcision was the 8. day, that is, the first after the Sabbath, this 8. day, that is, the first after the Sabbath and the Lords day went before in an image, which image ceased, the truth after coming upon it, and the Spiritual Circumcision being given us. For which reason we think none ought to be hindred from obtaining the grace of Christ, nor that the Spiritual Circumcision ought to be hindred by the carnal, but that every man altogether is to be admitted to the grace of Christ, sith Peter *also speaks and sayes in the Acts of the Apostles, The Lord hath said to me, none is to be said to be common and unclean. But if any thing might hinder men from the obtaining grace, more grievous sins might hinder grown men and commen to full stature & elder in birth. But moreover, if to most grievous offenders, and those that sin much before God, when after they believe remission of sins is given, and no man is withheld from Baptism and from grace, how much more ought not an Infant to be withheld, who being new born hath sins no whit, but that being born according to Adam carnally he drew on him in his first nativity the contagion of death of old: who in this respect doth more easily come to receive remission of sins, because not his own sins but anothers are forgiven him? And therefore most dear brother, this was our sentence in the Council, that none by us ought to be prohibited from Baptism, and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind and tender to all. Which as it is to be observed and held concerning Infants themselves and newly born, who in this respect do deserve more of our help and Divine mercy, because in the first beginning of their birth presently crying and weeping they do nothing else but pray. I wish to thee most dear brother alwayes health.*

For Mr. Richard Baxter *at* Kederminster.

Sir, some of my neighbours conceived it would be their best way to resolve their doubts about Baptism to know what arguments you could bring for Infant-baptism, and against their being baptized, notwithstanding the pretended Baptism they had in Infancy. Whereupon with my privity one came to you, upon whose relating to me your answer, I wrote to you, and upon receipt of your letter to me think good to let you understand, that I said not, I utterly refused open dispute, but that I affected it not, it being fit for Schools, and not common auditors, entered into usually with animosities and eagerness to obtain a supposed victory, managed with

with heat and multitude of words, with answers and replies not so del[illegible] rage as were requisite to settle any ones judgement, they being misap[illegible] hended by Auditors who commonly take him to have the better w[illegible] speaks the most, ending usually in wrangling or something like it, [illegible] lowed with misreports, accompanied w[illegible] disorders and inconvenien[illegible] insomuch that except in case of betraying truth by declining a dispute, I [illegible] hardly bring my self to yield to it. And howsoever you conceive of [illegible] advantages, you may if you will, and perhaps do know, that you h[illegible] such advantages in your ready wit and speech, and the favour and gen[illegible] acclamation to any thing that is said for the superstition of Infant-bap[illegible] as to bring things so to passe, that the event shall be crying down [illegible] and disgrace of my person. Nor have your disparaging speeches of [illegible] writings without animadversions on them communicated to me, or [illegible] carriage at or not long after the receipt of my letter, encouraged me to h[illegible] for all candour from you in this matter. For preaching, sith it belong[illegible] you to maintain the Divine institution of Infant-baptism, I shall be wil[illegible] to examine what you say, when you have said what you think good [illegible] if I may obtain a copy of your Sermon which you will own; [illegible] if it satisfie me, I shall confesse it, if not in a Sermon in the [illegible] [illegible]ace or elsewhere I shall give a distinct and plain answer to it. [illegible] [illegible]iting (which I like best) I desire not to put you to any tedious or [illegible] [illegible]nous way, but in the most compendious way of syllogisms, yea if it [illegible] [illegible], that you put in one *medium* the strength of all you can. Of the [illegible] [illegible]ch you desire, you may assure your self who are to be the opponen[illegible] [illegible]int, my answer will be as short as your argument will permit, [illegible] [illegible] you contract it keeping to the point, the more satisfactory it [illegible] [illegible] am

Bewdley,

Sept. 10. 16

Yours in our Lord

JOHN TOMB[illegible]